

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HOW CAN WE GET OUR OVERBLOWN FEDERAL DEFICITS UNDER CONTROL?

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, as we begin this 2d session of the 98th Congress, one question dominates our agenda: How can we get our overblown Federal deficits under control? That question, as Hamlet would say, "puzzles the will," and especially in an election year when difficult choices are more difficult than ever to make.

But it is a question that the Congress cannot duck. We must confront it quickly and we must do our best to answer it honestly. If there are among us any who doubt the urgency of the need to control Federal deficits, I commend to their attention an article by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. MATHIAS, which appeared in the Outlook section of the Washington Post on January 22.

Mr. MATHIAS is chairman of the International Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, and knows whereof he speaks when he warns that—

We are living in an economic fantasy world, and the longer we indulge ourselves in illusions, the more danger there is of a truly terrible comeuppance.

His conclusion, following a penetrating analysis of the potentially catastrophic domestic and international repercussions of unbridled deficits, is that—

No industrialized country, particularly the United States with its special responsibilities, can afford to conduct its economic policies oblivious to their effects on the international economy. Our economic health depends on the health of the world economy. The medicine needed to sustain the good health of both of them is the same: a major reduction in U.S. deficits.

I commend Mr. MATHIAS' wise counsel to the attention of my colleagues and I would also urge them to read the companion piece in the Post written by Governors Richard Lamm of Colorado, William Janklow of South Dakota, Scott Matheson of Utah, and Richard Snelling of Vermont. These distinguished political leaders—two Republicans and two Democrats—see the Federal deficits as "a prescription for disaster." They too call on the Congress and the President to act now to rein them in. I ask that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

The full texts of Mr. MATHIAS' article and the Governors' article follow:

WE'RE IGNORING THE OUTSIDE WORLD, BUT FOREIGNERS CAN CLOBBER OUR DOLLAR  
(By Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.)

By now, most Americans are aware that the huge federal deficit poses enormous dangers to the country's future economic health. But many of them, I fear, still do not realize what dire consequences the deficit may have for the world economy and for the currency on which the international financial system is based: the dollar.

As we enter 1984 there is a real danger that the deficit crisis could turn into a dollar crisis, complete with a financial panic, rekindled U.S. inflation and soaring interest rates. A dollar crisis will bring global recession and perhaps the permanent erosion of America's international competitive position.

Warnings of the impending storm already are coming from international financial markets and foreign governments. They are dumbfounded that the glaring defects in the present recovery seem invisible to a U.S. administration responsible for the world's largest economy and principal currency.

The failure to react forcefully to the threat posed by a dollar that is now grossly overvalued in relation to other major currencies illustrates all too vividly the tendency of this administration to view the U.S. economy in isolation from the rest of the world.

The dollar is used in about 80 percent of all international transactions in the non-communist world. Dollars make up three-quarters of the reserves of central banks. And, of course, dollars are used to measure this country's economic "bottom line": the balance between the funds that are going out and the funds that are coming in.

The relative strength of the dollar compared to other currencies determines our balance of trade, the cost of oil to all industrial nations, and much else besides.

Despite its overriding importance, though, this administration pursues domestic and international economic policies that treat the dollar as just another free-floating commodity, like pork bellies or orange juice. It ignores the damage such policies do to the competitiveness of U.S. business, to trade relations with Europe and Japan and to finances of Third World nations.

The immediate reason Americans should be greatly concerned about an overvalued dollar is clearcut: it hurts U.S. companies that are trying to sell their products abroad.

True, we derive some benefits from the situation. When we go abroad, we can exchange our dollars for more pounds, francs and marks than we could several years ago because of the exchange rate advantage of our "strong" dollars. Ski trips to the Alps or a gourmet tour of France have suddenly become much cheaper. (The dollar has risen 89 percent against the franc since 1980.)

The overpriced dollar also makes our imports cheaper, since we now need fewer dollars than we once did to buy goods that are priced in pounds or lira. This helps hold down U.S. inflation.

But the overvalued dollar hurts U.S. companies that live off exports, including many of our most dynamic, innovative firms. It's as if U.S. companies suddenly marked up all their prices by 25 to 50 percent while competitors in Italy or Germany were holding the line on theirs. Obviously, we lose business, billions of dollars worth. Unless we can sell abroad, we will see further growth in our merchandise trade deficit, which is estimated unofficially to have reached \$70 billion in 1983—the largest in history.

We could all rejoice if the "strong" dollar were a sign of the underlying strength of our economy—but it isn't. This brings me to my real worry. We are living in an economic fantasy world, and the longer we indulge ourselves in our illusions, the more danger there is of a truly terrible comeuppance.

The dollar has been rising steadily in value principally because real interest rates are high in this country. (Real interest is the difference between the rates borrowers pay or lenders receive and the rate of inflation in any economy. With out prime rate now at 11 percent and inflation at about 3.2 percent, the real interest rate in America is roughly 7.8 percent. In Japan today it is 3.2 percent.)

One reason real interest rates are high is that they have to be, in order to lure to our shores the quantities of foreign money needed to finance our monstrous federal deficit.

To be sure, some people abroad have been exchanging their own currencies for dollars because they view America as a secure place, a "safe haven." The United States' political stability makes it attractive to investors throughout the world. But most analysts agree that high interest rates are the main reason foreigners have been rushing to buy dollars. The stampede into dollars (which are then used to buy U.S. Treasury bills, certificates of deposit and so forth) naturally forces up the price of the dollars that are being bought, compared to the prices of the currencies being sold to buy them.

A herd instinct is at work in the financial markets. As the dollar continues to rise, it is smart speculation to buy that currency. And this is precisely what money managers, treasurers of big corporations and speculators have been doing—thereby adding to the demand for, and raising the value of, the dollar.

This is where the future begins to look really scary. What goes up *must* come down. Eventually, currency traders will get nervous about the fundamental contradiction between a "strong" dollar and a huge American trade deficit—a sign the United States isn't paying its own way. At some point—the experts all disagree about when—the fundamentals will assert themselves. Foreigners who are holding dollars will decide that the stampede has run its course, or that they have made enough money, or that investment opportunities are more attractive elsewhere. They will begin to switch out of dollars and back into other currencies.

Why should we care? Because a stampede by the financial markets *away* from the dollar would expose this country for the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

first time to the full extent of its fiscal folly.

We are already in a terrible bind. The government has been relying on foreign funds to help it finance the deficit. It is no exaggeration to say that we are being propped up by foreign loans—the loans that foreigners make when they buy Treasury bills or commercial CDs.

But if foreigners suddenly pulled out of dollars—if they stopped helping us finance our government debt—the pool of funds available for borrowing by the U.S. government and business would shrink drastically.

As long as interest rates stay high, some argue, we don't have to worry about foreigners switching their money out of dollars and setting off a panic. But consider what happened in 1977, as described by British economist Stephen Marris in the Dec. 26 issue of *Fortune*: "In October 1977, investment in U.S. securities paid roughly 3 percentage points more than comparable investments in West Germany. Yet over the following 12 months the dollar fell against the mark by 23 percent. . . . To most international observers, therefore, it seems that the dollar could well go down as fast as it came up."

For the manager of a giant multinational corporation's cash, the great fear must be that he'll be caught holding dollars when the dollar's value tumbles 20 or 25 percent. If that happens, the fact that the dollar is earning 10 or 12 percent interest won't provide much comfort. That's why the people who control movable capital will be watching the dollar carefully, and will join a stampede away from it if one begins.

If foreigners do decide to take a significant amount of their money out of dollars but our deficits remain high, the federal government would be competing with private investors for a much smaller amount of borrowable dollars. Obviously, interest rates would rise, perhaps sharply, just when corporations urgently need to borrow money for the long-term investment required to sustain the recovery. At the same time, the decline in the dollar's value would suddenly make foreign goods much more expensive to us—just as our goods are expensive to foreigners now. That would fuel U.S. inflation.

In other words, we could have the worst of all worlds: higher interest rates, inflation and probably another recession, starting in the United States but inevitably spreading to the rest of the world.

All of this comes back to the deficit. If there was not a huge deficit to finance, we could take a more relaxed view of the fluctuations in the financial markets. We would not have to worry about foreigners pulling out, because we would not need them to shoulder a big portion of our debt. But as long as business and government have to compete for loanable funds, as they do now, we are at the mercy of the financial markets.

It is worth noting one other disturbing trend related to the deficit and the dollar. This country is reaching a point where it can no longer count on its investments abroad, and the services it provides abroad, to make up for its trade deficit.

Traditionally, we have been able to offset some of the trade deficit by the earnings generated overseas by U.S. corporations and investors. In 1982, this country had \$168 billion more invested abroad than foreigners had invested here. But the situation is changing. In 1983, the advantage slipped to \$128 billion. In just a few years, the United States could squander its foreign investment position—and with it a major piece of its financial security.

But these economic doomsday scenarios are not inevitable. Indeed, the workings of the international economy are so intricate and complex that a host of factors could change the way events unfold.

A much brighter scenario could be written if some elementary precautions were taken by the administration to prevent a dollar crisis. By steadily reducing the deficit and allowing the dollar to decline slowly to a more realistic value, we could prevent this bubble from bursting.

The first step is to do something immediately about the deficit. A group of responsible and concerned members of the U.S. Senate has repeatedly offered to work with the administration on a deficit reduction package. These overtures have been ignored. The administration refuses to consider taxes in an election year and seems content to preside over another 12 months of declining trade and escalating deficits.

The U.S. Treasury should be less reluctant to intervene actively in the currency markets by using its considerable resources to hold the value of the dollar down. The Treasury can do this by selling dollars or buying foreign currencies on the open market.

Treasury officials have stated that they are now more willing to intervene when they think such action can have a positive effect. This is welcome news. More welcome would be a clear statement that such intervention was part of a comprehensive U.S. policy to do something about the exorbitantly priced dollar. But that would require, first of all, a deficit reduction package. Instead, the U.S. Treasury applauds and encourages foreign financing of federal deficits.

From my vantage point as chairman of the subcommittee on international economic policy of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have often seen foreign governments make short-sighted decisions at the expense of the world economy for brief domestic advantage. But the sheer size of the U.S. economy (we represent about 25 percent of world industrial production) and the continued role of the dollar in world commerce gives the United States special responsibilities.

The old adage is true: When the U.S. economy gets a sniffle, the world economy gets pneumonia. We are recklessly buying today's federal services by embezzling from our children and grandchildren. Our towering deficits demonstrate to our friends and partners that we do not take our global responsibilities seriously—that we are willing to let the world economy suffer with pneumonia and pleurisy to get short-term relief from the sniffles.

No industrialized country, particularly the United States with its special responsibilities, can afford to conduct its domestic economic policies oblivious to their effects on the international economy. Our economic health depends on the health of the world economy. The medicine needed to sustain the good health of both of them is the same: a major reduction in U.S. budget deficits.

In many areas, President Reagan has had the luck associated with his Irish ancestry. I hope for all our sakes that his luck will continue. But if, as I fear, by St. Patrick's Day he has not begun to work with Congress to deal seriously with the deficits, no amount of luck will prevent the economic disaster ahead.

#### A CRY FROM THE HEARTLAND: DEFICITS WILL IMPOVERISH OUR GRANDCHILDREN

(By Richard D. Lamm, William J. Janklow, Scott M. Matheson, and Richard A. Snelling)

The Federal deficits facing this country are a prescription for disaster. We are borrowing from our children to give ourselves tax relief, borrowing from our grandchildren to pay medical benefits that we really can't afford, borrowing from our great-grandchildren to give pensions that we know very well are chain letters to the future.

We are four governors—two Democrats and two Republicans—who believe there is no higher priority on the American political scene than to form a bipartisan coalition to bring reality therapy to our delusional belief that we can continue on this road to ruin. As the Congress returns Monday, and the President addresses the state of the union Wednesday, we offer this modest proposal as an agenda for our return to fiscal sanity.

Neither we nor any serious economist believes that the United States economy can sustain the long-term mismatch between federal revenues and expenditures. The existing debt is \$1.2 trillion; the annual federal deficit has grown from 2 percent of the gross national product in 1981 to more than 6 percent in 1983. In the next six years an accumulation of another \$1.3 trillion in debt is projected. These two factors—the size of the debts we currently are undertaking and the size of the already enormous cumulative debt—create a problem of unique proportions.

Through repetition and familiarity, we are in danger of becoming inured to the dimensions of the dollars we are dealing with. How much is a billion, anyway?

A billion seconds ago was 1951. A billion minutes ago Jesus Christ was walking the earth. A billion hours ago no one on this planet was walking erect on two feet. But in Washington, a billion dollars ago was only 10.3 hours.

Deficits of these magnitudes may strand real interest rates at historic highs and will seriously interface with private reinvestment. There is general agreement that the national economy will gain strength for a good part of 1984. But there is equally broad agreement that by late 1984 or early 1985, this recovery will weaken. If the recession of 1985 combines the typical cyclical weakness with an unprecedented credit crunch, the result could be catastrophic.

In light of this danger, it is astounding that both the Congress and the administration seem to have drifted toward a conclusion that no decisive action be considered until after the next presidential election. We cannot understand how those in Washington can accept a planned policy which exposes the nation to such risk for another 15 months.

There is plenty of blame to distribute. Every president and every Congress for the last 25 years is partially at fault, as is a public that tolerated this policy. While we can debate which party is most at fault, we all agree that—Democrat or Republican—it clearly is easier to be a politician in times of plenty than in times scarcity.

That is why we urge formation of a coalition of political people to do unpolitical things. The nation desperately needs a bipartisan group to make the decisions that are so difficult in the current climate. In short, we need to create an environment in



which our nation's leaders can use that most unpopular of political words—"no."

The imperative is even more demanding because the U.S. economy is not breaking new ground. Circumstances have improved in the last year, but in 1973, median household income—adjusted for inflation—was \$11,397. By 1982, it had slipped to \$11,326. Very quietly, the United States has seen its economy falter and stagnate.

Yet our political reach continues to exceed our grasp. We have formed platforms, goals and agendas based on an economic system that once ranked first in the world. We are now fifth in the world in per-capita income, however, and we may well have suffered an irreversible loss of industrial might. Politics is the management of expectations, but our expectations are out of the 1960s while the realities are those of the 1980s.

A society cannot consume and public policy cannot distribute what a society has not produced. When public decisionmakers are faced, not with spending new wealth, but with reallocating existing wealth, they experience a whole new set of pressures. All four of us have faced these pressures on the political stump. We know how hard it is to say no to constituency groups, to deflate expectations, to disappoint people. These are not the decisions on which political careers are made. Nevertheless, we believe the nation needs a bipartisan solution to these problems.

One of the most influential constituency groups is the defense establishment. We believe that defense spending should be increased—but not at the 7 percent real growth rate suggested by the Reagan administration. Congress is on the same wavelength. A bipartisan consensus seems to exist for an annual increase in defense spending between 3 and 5 percent. We fear that the president's proposed level of spending would build a 1980s Maginot line—a large and impressive military establishment atop an economy in shambles.

If defense appropriations are increased by 1 percent in real growth over the next four years, only \$1 billion would be added to the deficit in fiscal year 1984. But by fiscal year 1988, because of the long defense pipeline and the compounding effect, these 1 percent increases will have added \$11 billion to the deficit. Holding defense spending to 4 percent real growth, rather than the president's proposed level, could save a cumulative \$52 billion by fiscal year 1986.

National politicians also have a difficult time saying no to entitlements. They call these expenditures "uncomfortable." But Congress should not be permitted to pretend that nothing can be done about these programs. The Congress created them and it can contain them. There should be no higher priority.

The dialogue must begin by making it clear that a common characteristic of the so-called entitlement programs is eligibility standards which do not test the financial need or capacity of those who will receive the benefits. The politics of entitlement are clearly hazardous; nevertheless, we urge changes in the sensitive areas of Medicare and federal pensions.

The cost of Medicare has risen 17 percent a year for the last 10 years. This program for older Americans has recently been doubling approximately every three and a half years. Even under the president's proposed budget, Medicare will increase \$57 billion over the next five years. These outlandish and unsustainable increases can't go on.

There are two basic ways to reduce the cost of Medicare: to push more of the costs into beneficiaries, and to limit payments to providers. We suggest both.

We essentially have given providers a blank check for all Medicare patients. Then we react in surprise when they fill in large amounts. Medical science is inventing treatments faster than public policy can pay for them. Overall, 10 cents of each dollar spent in America goes to health care costs, rising at 2½ times the rate of inflation.

The well-meaning kidney dialysis program, started in 1976 for a first-year cost of \$150 million, is already up to \$2 billion and growing dramatically. We are transplanting organs in operations thought impossible only a few years ago and are now inventing artificial organs. Less dramatic but equally important is the staggering cost of some of the great advances in medicine. Take cataract surgery, for example. Since 1965 the incidence per 100,000 people over the age 65 of operations for cataracts has tripled and virtually all of them are paid for by Medicare.

If inefficiencies in our current health care system are corrected, we believe a reformed health care system can deliver the existing level of care to most Medicare patients for several years. However, we cannot delude ourselves that even increased efficiency can control the current program in the long term. Hard choices about access to medical care are going to have to be made.

As recently as Jan. 1, 1983, the Veterans' Administration every month sent out pension checks to 41 widows of Civil War veterans and 26 widows of Indian War veterans, as well as paying benefits to 9,182 widows of Spanish-American War veterans and 52 veterans of that war. We will be paying pensions to dependents of Vietnam veterans until the year 2097. Pensions clearly are forever and this fiscal implication has not been accepted by politicians.

We rapidly are becoming a four-generation society. Social Security, including Medicare, roared past the \$100 billion mark in 1977; only five years later it went over \$200 billion. The long-term unfunded liability of Social Security, which does not appear in the normal \$1.2 trillion federal deficit, stands somewhere between \$3 trillion and \$5 trillion. The unfunded debt of the military pensions alone has hit \$590 billion; add the unfunded liability of federal civil service pensions and you have a pension amount that almost equals the national debt.

Generals can retire and, two years after retirement, receive more as a pension than the people who, replaced them make. These pensions are indexed by generous cost-of-living provisions. All of these groups are organized, all of them vote and all of them contribute to political campaigns.

Nevertheless, we think it better to rock the boat than to sail it under false colors. We propose that Congress adopt a measure—not original with us—to hold Social Security and federal pension increases 2 percent below the inflation rate beginning in 1985. This measure alone would reduce governmental spending more than \$40 billion over four years with only minimal impact on most Americans.

We also would propose raising the retirement age by at least three years on a gradual basis—three months per year starting in 1990. Even with the new eligibility age, the average retired person would enjoy benefits for a long period than did their parents or grandparents.

We also propose taxing a portion of Social Security retirement benefits received by in-

dividuals whose incomes are above \$12,000 and families whose incomes exceed \$18,000. Lower-income Social Security beneficiaries would not be affected. This proposal would help to correct the current indefensible situation in which 18 percent of Social Security benefits go to families which have retirement incomes over \$30,000 per year.

We recognize that this would introduce means testing to Social Security, but we believe that this solution is inevitable. Some actuarial tables show that by 2020, it may take as much as 40 percent of the average paycheck just to support Social Security. Today it takes 100 tax-paying workers to support about 30 Social Security beneficiaries. By the year 2050, because our population is aging, the same 100 workers may have more than 70 beneficiaries to support. It isn't a question of if we change this program; the question is when.

In the federal retirement systems, both military and civil service, we would advocate changes in such things as early retirement and urge similar indexing 2 percent below the rate of inflation. Reforms also should be sought in other programs such as railroad retirement benefits, the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Funds, Coast Guard Retirement Fund, Tax Court Judges' Survivors Annuity Fund and the Public Health Service Officers Retirement Pay and Medical Benefits Fund.

Finally, although raising taxes is the most hazardous thing that a politician can do or even suggest, we believe imposing new taxes is better than continuing to borrow from our children to avoid making hard decisions today. We believe that taxpayers would be less antagonistic about paying new taxes if some dramatic reform of the federal system was taking place and they were no longer being asked to fund a government long out of control.

One way to make our tax system fairer and generate additional revenues is to prune the tax deductions and credits granted to one group or another—the "tax-expenditure budget." The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates these costs will be almost \$330 billion in 1984 and that they will exceed \$490 billion by fiscal year 1988. In the face of enormous deficits, we would suggest selecting items from the tax expenditure budget to close loopholes in our existing system.

We would further propose modification of the new tax-indexing law that goes into effect in 1985. Instead of fully indexing tax brackets to inflation, we propose indexing 2 percent below the inflation rate. This would force taxpayers to pay a little more than they would otherwise, but no individual would be badly hurt. The additional revenue from just this procedure would be more than \$37 billion over four years.

Our thesis is that the current course of federal deficits is unsustainable and will lead this country into another recession and, possibly, into a depression. To finance deficits of the magnitude of \$200 billion to \$300 billion a year, every American worker would have to save \$2,000 to \$3,000 and loan it all to the federal government.

A deficit this large makes the federal government a competitor with private business, which needs to borrow funds for new plants, equipment and inventory. Such a large deficit also competes with consumers seeking funds for housing and other durable goods and with state and local governments needing to finance capital outlay. The extent of the borrowing tends to increase interest rates, depress both investment and consumption and traumatize our economy.

In the end, we must find a way for our common interests as Americans to override our conflicting interests as retirees, doctors, military people, federal employees and so on. America's future is at stake and we must be willing to make hard decisions. We, as practicing politicians, have put ourselves on the line with these preliminary suggestions in hopes that others will surface their own proposals and that soon a bipartisan coalition, dedicated to fiscal sanity, will arise. ●

### PLAYING WITH THE END

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we struggle to find the answers to the complex question of how best to defend the country and prevent catastrophic international conflict, the Pentagon planners continue to plot a nuclear war in which the United States can prevail. I commend to my colleagues' attention the excellent analysis of this paradox and the problems and dangers it entails by Mr. Arthur Cox, from the New York Times op-ed page.

#### END THE WAR GAME

(By Arthur Macy Cox)

American strategic planners have been thinking the unthinkable for more than 25 years: trying to make nuclear warfare controllable and even winnable. The result has been an escalating nuclear arms race that has increasingly reduced our security and endangered our survival.

Why is it so dangerous? Because a war-fighting doctrine is fundamentally incompatible with a policy of unclear deterrence: The greater the capacity to fight a nuclear war, the more likely it is that deterrence will fail because of increased chances that a war will start through accident, miscalculation or pre-emption in a time of crisis.

The struggle between the war fighters and the advocates of stable deterrence began in the late 1950's. Then, as now, the deterrence advocates believed that nuclear weapons must never be used and that the best way to insure that they won't is for each side to have the assured capacity to destroy the other. This threat—of mutual national suicide—has for years prevented war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The war fighters have ridiculed the notion of mutual assured destruction. They call it MAD and they claim that it is immoral because it would mean destroying cities. They also argue that it won't deter war because the Russians don't believe in it and are prepared to fight a nuclear war; that it doesn't provide an alternative in case deterrence fails; and, perhaps most important, that it doesn't permit us to build the military power with which to coerce the Soviet Union.

In 1962, these arguments persuaded Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to adopt a strategy for a controlled and flexible nuclear response aimed at military targets rather than cities—a counterforce strategy. This was the first attempt to make nuclear war more rational and moral. It was also the first attempt to develop a war-fighting strategy—a plan for a limited nuclear

war. Such a theory made no sense then and it makes no sense today.

Our allies Britain and France have no illusions about the apparent morality of counterforce doctrine. Both aim their nuclear missiles at Soviet cities in the hope that this will deter a Soviet attack. As one French nuclear expert recently said: "In a half hour, the submarines alone could kill 50 million people. That should be enough to dissuade any adversary." The Kremlin, too, targets cities. In contrast, Washington asserts that its nuclear targets are military, including military industry, yet, inevitably, this means cities—including 60 military targets in Moscow alone.

There can be no relative degree of morality about the use of nuclear weapons. The principles of "just war" theory and proportionality are irrelevant to nuclear war. Nor will there ever be a limited nuclear war: It would take two to play and the Kremlin won't. Its policy is very explicit: Moscow will not be first to use nuclear weapons, but if attacked with such weapons, its response will not be limited.

Yet, for some years, our policy has been based on the notion that Moscow would try to fight a limited nuclear war. When Harold Brown became Secretary of Defense in 1977, he categorically rejected the idea of such a war. But in August 1980, he joined Zbigniew Brzezinski in drafting Presidential Directive 59, which adopted a war-fighting theory that included plans for limited nuclear war. Why? Because, in his view, the Soviet leadership appeared to think a nuclear victory was possible.

In fact, during the 1950's and 1960's, Soviet military leaders did assert that if their country were ever attacked with nuclear weapons, it would fight and ultimately win the war. But for the past decade, Soviet leaders including Leonid I. Brezhnev; Yuri V. Andropov; the Defense Minister, Marshal Dmitri Ustinov; and Chief of Staff, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, have agreed that there can be no winners in a nuclear war—only holocaust.

Mr. McNamara has also changed his view and today rejects the concepts of flexible response and limited nuclear warfare. He now says: "Nuclear weapons serve no military purpose whatsoever. They are totally useless—except only deter one's opponent from using them."

Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger, in contrast, clearly believes that the United States should be prepared to fight a protracted nuclear war and to prevail, as outlined in the five-year Defense Guidance he signed in 1982. At the time, he said: "You show me a Secretary of Defense who is not planning to prevail and I'll show you a Secretary of Defense who ought to be impeached." Yet even Secretary Weinberger has acknowledged on several subsequent occasions that nuclear wars are not winnable.

Nevertheless, the Reagan Administration is vigorously pursuing a doctrine that would theoretically allow us to prevail by "decapitating" the Soviet state. This would mean destroying the Soviet civilian and military leadership and the communication system that controls the launching of Soviet nuclear weapons. But the main value of the decapitation threat, it is claimed, would be to coerce Moscow. This is a dangerous fantasy—a self-deluded effort to restore a political advantage that was lost forever when the United States lost strategic nuclear superiority.

The other argument that the war fighters use against deterrence is the possibility that

it may break down. Some 20 years ago, the influential nuclear strategist William Kaufmann argued that a counterforce strategy was justified if there was so much as a 5 percent chance that deterrence would fail. Today, Mr. Kaufmann, like his former boss Mr. McNamara, has apparently come to doubt the wisdom of this calculation. Mr. Weinberger, however, has no doubt. He recently wrote: "when deterrence fails . . . the dividends of a viable war-fighting defense are unquestionable." This is an illogical, desperate thesis that will almost inevitably lead to catastrophe—for the more we rely on a war-fighting strategy, supposedly in order to back up our deterrent, the more likely it is that deterrence will fail. This is particularly true as technology advances, leaving less and less time for human decision-making and encouraging strategists to rely on computers—thus increasing the risk of accident or pre-emptive strike.

If we want to survive, we must try to make deterrence as stable as possible. This means acknowledging that nuclear weapons are of no value in our competition with the Soviet Union except for deterring a nuclear exchange. It means rejecting all theories of nuclear war-fighting. It means getting back to genuine arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union. Other useful steps include moving away from multiple-warhead missiles and returning to single warheads. Bombers with air-launched cruise missiles are also relatively stable: They are slow, can be turned back and don't pose a first-strike threat. So are submarines, which are not so vulnerable to attack.

Other measures to enhance the stability of deterrence would include a continuation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a mutual ban on the testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons, a mutual ban on space-based weapons, a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapons testing, a ban on the deployment of nuclear weapons that impede arms control by making adequate verification more difficult or impossible and, finally, efforts to improve communications between the superpowers.

Such measures are indispensable if we are to avoid accidental or unintentional nuclear war. And in the end, if the superpowers can't find a more stable basis for our competition, we probably won't survive. ●

### CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS POST 1419

**HON. FRANK HARRISON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, January 28, the Catholic War Veterans Father Albanese Post No. 1419, of Berwick, Pa., will conduct its annual dinner dance.

This is a significant event not only for the officers and members of the Father Albanese Post but for the entire greater Berwick community. Since 1947, Post 1419 has upheld the highest ideals in patriotism and community service. This year, as Lyle Augustine is installed as commander, it renews its dedication to God and country.



This organization has been in the forefront of bringing to light the concerns of veterans. They conduct and participate in ceremonies honoring those who have served their country. Among their activities are a Veterans' Day parade and ceremony, a Memorial Day observance through the placing of flags on veterans graves, and a Columbus Day parade.

Post 1419 receives State and national recognition for its distribution of over 600 potted shamrocks, on St. Patrick's Day to the patients of the Veterans' Administration Hospital and Nursing Home in Wilkes-Barre. This project has been a tradition for 20 years and is financed totally through contributions for the Catholic War Veterans' "Cross of Peace."

Additionally, the post is active in youth programs and, at the local level, conducts the National Catholic War Veterans spelling contests and oratorical contests.

Post 1419 has over 250 regular members, ranking seventh in the State and 20th in the Nation. Its members are active on both the State and national level and, most recently, Past Post Commander Joseph (Jiggs) DiPasquale has served for two consecutive terms as State commander for the Department of Pennsylvania.

It is a pleasure and an honor, Mr. Speaker, for me to congratulate Father Albanese Post 1419 on this occasion of its annual dinner dance and the installation of its officers. The pleasure is all the greater, Mr. Speaker, because I am a member of that post and have, for the past 5 years, been privileged to observe and participate in an outstanding record of service to God, country, and community.●

#### LUJAN SUPPORTS JUDICIAL REVIEW FOR VETERANS

#### HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor of a bill which would provide for judicial review for veterans. The legislation, H.R. 1959, the Veterans' Administration Adjudication Procedure and Judicial Review Act, would give veterans access to the judicial system if a veteran disagrees with the final decision of the Board of Veterans Appeals and feels that a court review of the decision is necessary.

The bill would also provide for reasonable attorney's fees which had previously been limited to \$10. Thus a veteran will be able to obtain the services of an attorney at a fee affordable to the veteran.

Under the current law, a veteran's claim for benefits is decided upon en-

tirely within the framework of the Veterans' Administration and may not be brought before the courts for review or adjudication. This bill would restore to veterans their fundamental constitutional rights. The Senate has passed similar legislation for the last three sessions of Congress and it is time for the House of Representatives to act.

H.R. 1959 should be considered as soon as possible. The Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has already completed hearings on the bill and I hope the full Veterans' Affairs Committee will take up consideration as quickly as possible. It is time to remedy this situation and provide veterans with the right to judicial review and the right to be represented by counsel.●

#### A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO WALTER E. GARRISON

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Walter E. Garrison who is retiring from his post as chief engineer and general manager of the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts.

Engineers usually do not inspire great poetry or great praise, probably because most engineers are doers, practical men and women of daily business and straight-forward problem solving. And this is necessary because, more than any other profession, engineers make the world go around. But some very few engineers are even more: they are people with vision. They have the talent, the training, the careful know-how, nurtured over the years, to put their vision into being. Walter Garrison is one of these persons, a dedicated public servant, who has translated his vision into reality and who has helped southern California grow in the past four decades that his career spans.

A native of New Jersey, Walt earned his bachelor of science degree from the Cooper Union in 1942. He served 4 years during World War II in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and joined the engineering staff of the county sanitation districts of Los Angeles County in 1948.

Walt worked in various capacities in the sanitation districts, and pioneered wastewater recovery and refuse systems—and simultaneously the modern sewerage disposal methods—that have made available, affordable and sustainable water resources for Los Angeles County.

In 1979, he was appointed chief engineer and general manager of the districts. In this position Walt has gener-

al oversight of the organization that provides sewerage, wastewater reuse, and refuse disposal sites for approximately 4 million people living in all or part of 75 cities and large tracts of unincorporated land within a 730-square-mile area in Los Angeles County. In conjunction with the water supply agencies and the health agencies, Walt has developed a system of reclaiming almost 100 million gallons of freshwater daily. Under his tutelage, engineers in Los Angeles County have pioneered methods of recovering methane gas from landfills to produce electricity.

Walt has somehow found time to become actively involved with numerous national, State, and local organizations in the field. These include the Water Pollution Control Federation, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the California Association of Sanitation Engineers, the Joint Technical Advisory Committee, the American Academy of Environmental Engineers, and the American Public Works Association. In addition, he has worked as a consultant to many municipalities, has published numerous papers in the field and is on the management advisory group to the construction grants program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, Walter Garrison has faced many tough problems and has been asked to make hard decisions. He has, however, viewed these situations as challenges, incentives to convert liabilities to assets. My district and 4 million people in southern California are better off because of him.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Walt Garrison on a job well done. We wish him and his wife, June, their six children, John, Paulette, Richard, Teresa, Chris, and Jan all the best in their future endeavors.●

#### LSC REGULATIONS ON ELIGIBILITY MUST BE ELIMINATED

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joined by my colleague OLYMPIA SNOWE and our colleagues in introducing legislation that would repeal the new client eligibility regulations promulgated by the Legal Services Corporation on November 30.

This bill is necessary if we are to preserve legal services for the poor elderly of this Nation. The existing regulations which serve to restrict eligibility for seniors are ill-founded. There is no good reason why the regulations should have been changed in the first place given the fact that they were successful in assuring the availability of legal services for senior citizens

who, in many cases, have no where else to turn for such help.

Let me provide my colleagues with the history which brings us to this point today. It is a point which has not been arrived at without significant debate and consideration. On September 22, my Subcommittee on Human Services of the House Select Committee on Aging conducted hearings on proposed client eligibility regulations put forth by the Legal Services Corporation on August 29. At the hearing, we received testimony from 18 witnesses representing the poor elderly and disabled communities, on the impact of these proposed regulations upon the existing legal services network. The testimony was overwhelmingly opposed to these regulations. I was joined by my colleague and our ranking minority member Mrs. SNOWE, in calling for these regulations to be withdrawn.

We also received testimony from the Legal Services Corporation which assured us that they would consider our recommendation. Despite several subsequent requests of the LSC Board that they cease their plans to go forth with the new guidelines, they nonetheless determined to publish the original regulations in final form on November 30 which are only slightly modifies from the original proposals.

These final regulations, which we seek to overturn, would mandate assets tests upon elderly clients—which for the first time in the history of the program—could include such nonliquid assets such as the value of a home—up to \$15,000—work-related equipment—such as farm tractors and trailers—as well as any transportation vehicle used for employment or other means, such as medical purposes. This counting of nonliquid assets is a clear violation of the LSC authorizing statute which only allows the counting of liquid assets. Many, if not most elderly citizens, even those with low or fixed incomes, will have accumulated at least \$1,500 in nonliquid assets over the course of their lifetime—which would disqualify them under these rules.

Group representation services to elderly nursing home residents would be eliminated. Despite the clear mandate in the LSC statute—which I authored in the 1977 amendments that directed the Corporation to place a priority upon serving the elderly and disabled—the poorest and most vulnerable of our seniors residing in nursing homes could not be served unless the group which sought to represent them was primarily composed of eligible individuals under the new guidelines. This attempt to stifle advocacy groups from protecting the institutionalized and disabled must not be allowed to happen. Many advocacy groups have been critical in assuring nursing home residents have access to legal services

in the event their rights are threatened or eliminated in any fashion.

Finally, the provision in existing law which makes those persons receiving public benefits automatically eligible for legal services is eliminated. This "public benefits exemption" was critical to minimizing the paperwork in this program and assuring that attorneys spend the bulk of their resources serving needy clients—not filing additional and unnecessary forms. Instead of reducing paperwork under these regulations—we have added to the existing paper chase that can only serve to hinder services to needy clients.

At the subcommittee hearing, the justification for moving forth with new eligibility regulations at this time was that inadequate funding was available to carry out the LSC mandate. This is not the case at all given the fact that Congress increased the appropriation in fiscal year 1984 for the Corporation from \$241 million in fiscal years 1982 and 1983 to \$275 million for this year. At the same time, its own Board of Directors recommended a \$68.3 million increase over fiscal year 1983 of \$325.3 million for fiscal year 1985. Clearly, if the cornerstone of the Corporation's arguments in support of these new rules was lack of funds—this request has clearly diluted if not effectively destroyed their original argument.

I must also point out that these eligibility regulations were proposed by a Board of Directors which was composed of four "recess" appointees which were not approved by the traditional Senate confirmation process. Just last week, two more "recess" appointees were added to the Board. Given the fact that the entire method of selection is being challenged, it appears that to make major revisions in programs at this time is to thwart the role of Congress in exercising its role in approving those individuals who are making these decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bipartisan effort to reverse these regulations and to assure that those rules which were in effect previously are retained. I should point out, for the benefit of my colleagues, that we are taking two concurrent and complementary approaches in this legislation. The first is a bill to amend the LSC authorizing statute that would bar the new rules from taking effect. This bill will be offered as an amendment to the LSC reauthorization bill as considered by the House this year.

The second bill seeks to eliminate these rules through the appropriations process. We will offer this amendment when LSC appropriations legislation is considered this year. This two-prong approach, we feel, will assure that these regulations are overturned and that legal services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are retained.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point the texts of these two bills. I urge all those who share our concern for the elderly to join with us in co-sponsoring this most important legislation.

H.R. 4659

A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation Act to insure that procedures for determining eligibility of clients are no more restrictive than those in effect on January 1, 1983

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1007(a)(2) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f(a)(2)) is amended—*

(1) in subparagraph (B)(iv) by striking out "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end thereof; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) insure that income levels, guidelines, and procedures established pursuant to this paragraph do not exclude persons from being eligible for or provided legal assistance under this title who would not be so excluded under the income levels, guidelines, and procedures in effect under this paragraph on January 1, 1983;"

H.R. 4658

A bill to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Legal Services Corporation for the implementation of regulations, guidelines, or other procedures that are more restrictive with respect to the determination of eligibility of clients than those in effect on January 1, 1983

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no funds appropriated to the Legal Services Corporation may be used to implement any regulations, guidelines, procedures, or instructions issued by the Legal Services Corporation which would exclude any person from being eligible for or provided legal assistance under the Legal Services Corporation Act who would not be so excluded under the regulations, guidelines, procedures, and instructions of the Corporation in effect on January 1, 1983.●*

#### LEGISLATION TO REPEAL NEW ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES FOR LEGAL SERVICES

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague Congressman BIAGGI in sponsoring two measures today which will prevent the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) from implementing eligibility requirements that are more restrictive than those required for all other Federal social programs.

When these new, seemingly overly stringent regulations were first proposed by LSC last August, Congressman BIAGGI and I, as chairman and



ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Aging Subcommittee on Human Services, conducted a hearing to investigate their impact upon the elderly and disabled communities. Over 18 witnesses, representing the most vulnerable constituency groups in the country, strongly recommended withdrawal of the proposed regulations. It was predicted that the proposals would eliminate up to two-thirds of current eligible elderly clients, a most compelling argument to those of us concerned with the overall well-being of our Nation's older population.

Based upon such predictions, Chairman BIAGGI and I repeatedly petitioned the LSC Board to reconsider its proposals. Nevertheless, on November 30, the Board published their final guidelines. We were surprised to note that despite almost unanimous criticism, the guidelines were only slightly modified from their original form.

I seriously question the wisdom of this action by LSC in view of the fact that the present Board of Directors is composed of four members who are merely recess appointments, none of whom are included in the list of 11 nominees presently pending confirmation by the Senate.

Moreover, I am puzzled why LSC insists on this attempt to streamline eligibility rolls at a time when there are actually more dollars for LSC activities this year than there have been the preceeding 2 years—\$275 million in fiscal year 1984 versus \$241 million in fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983.

I would like to briefly point out only a few of the serious consequences of the final regulations for those Members who are also concerned with the elderly poor's access to legal services. The primary change is the establishment of a maximum national income level for eligible clients. All income, including Government income-maintenance benefits, as well as liquid and nonliquid assets—including equity in a home over \$15,000—will now be examined in determining whether an individual is eligible for legal services. Previously, Government income-maintenance benefits were excluded when computing income and only liquid net assets were examined. The practical effect of the old rules was to enable people who already qualified for food stamps or welfare to be automatically eligible for legal services, thus eliminating a time-consuming and expensive process already required by other Government programs.

Although the Corporation stresses its desire to maximize scarce resources as a rationale for these regulations, additional individual eligibility determinations will, in fact, use up valuable resources on unnecessary paperwork and reduce the level of services available to clients. Furthermore, these new limitations will probably disquali-

fy many people whose income is slightly over the maximum income limits, even if that income is derived solely from other Government assistance programs which are already means tested.

In addition, because the regulations require that the income of all resident family members be considered, elderly or disabled people living with relatives could be disqualified from legal assistance if the income and assets of those relatives are only slightly higher than the regulations allow. The only alternatives for these people is to move out on their own, which may be physically impossible and/or emotionally undesirable, or move into institutions, or to simply forgo legal services. Is this what the LSC Board has in mind as it insists on such dramatic new regulations?

The measures that Chairman BIAGGI and I have introduced today would guarantee that procedures for determining eligibility of clients are no more restrictive than those in effect on January 1, 1983. The first measure, already cosponsored by 36 members, amends the Legal Services Act to that effect. The second bill would prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the LSC if the client eligibility guidelines are more restrictive than those in effect on January 1, 1983. We plan to introduce this second bill to offer as an amendment to the Justice Department appropriations measure later this year.

I am convinced that these regulations are more injurious to the poor in this country than they are helpful, and I invite the support of my colleagues for this legislation which would prevent the imposition of these new guidelines recommended by four temporary, unconfirmed LSC Board members.●

#### DON'T DEPORT SALVADORAN REFUGEES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on November 17 last year, I joined with Representatives JIM MOAKLEY, JOEL PRITCHARD, BARNEY FRANK, TED WEISS, JIM JEFFORDS, ED TOWNS, and MIKE LOWRY to introduce needed legislation delaying the deportation of Salvadoran nationals residing in the United States. Citizens in El Salvador, particularly displaced persons, are the first to be victims of violence. That violence comes not only from the "death squads," but from a general breakdown of law and order: Essential services are not available, the judicial system is nonexistent, and citizens who become victims of the civil strife

have no safe haven to which they can run.

Despite documented evidence of the dangers in El Salvador, the Reagan administration maintains a policy of deporting Salvadoran nationals who have sought refuge in the United States. The Salvadorans who have fled to this country fear the generalized violence inherent in civil war. They do not ask for a new home here; they need temporary protection.

Staying deportation until Congress determines that conditions in El Salvador have reached a point that allows the safe return of its citizens is a reasonable approach to a dire problem. All other North and Central American countries now refrain from forcibly returning Salvadorans. The United States should follow suit.

I would like to call to my colleagues' attention an editorial from the New York Times in support of such a policy:

#### WHY POLES BUT NOT SALVADORANS?

This is a story about a case of bureaucratic doubletalk, which is harmless, and a double standard, which is not. The doubletalk is "extended voluntary departure," which means giving visitors to this country a port in a sudden storm. The double standard is that the United States gives such refuge to people from most of the world, but not to people from El Salvador. Why not?

There are refugees and there are refugees. Some come here precisely to find a permanent haven from persecution—Jews fleeing Hitler in the 30's, boat people fleeing Vietnam in the 70's. But others come here as visitors and are turned into refugees, while here, by events at home. To force them to return before the turmoil ends might be a death sentence.

The Ugandans, for example, who were here during Idi Amin's bloody last days . . . or the Iranian students in colleges across the country when the Ayatollah came to power . . . or the Poles visiting in this country when martial law was declared in theirs . . . or, now, the Salvadorans.

Some societies provide for temporary safe haven by law. American law makes no such provision but this country has evolved an informal one, under the Attorney General's prosecutory discretion: extended voluntary departure. That means if you are in a class of people found to need temporary haven in an emergency, you can stay. Even if your visa expires tomorrow morning, you have an extra six months, say, to wait out the storm back home, maybe longer.

For instance, if you are a Pole who was caught here when martial law was declared in your homeland in December 1981, your extended voluntary departure deadline is about to be extended yet again, to December 1983. Over the years, the Government has granted this kind of haven to other nationalities, too—Cubans, Czechs, Chileans, Ethiopians, Nicaraguans, Ugandans and Afghans. Why does this Administration refuse to grant such safe haven to Salvadorans?

One explanation concerns danger. State Department officials contend that the violence in El Salvador is not sufficiently intense or widespread to justify extended voluntary departure. It's a puzzling argument, coming just at the time the Administration

wants Congress to spend much more to help end the Salvadoran violence.

It would appear to be precisely in our foreign policy interest to affirm that conditions in El Salvador are dangerous, not to deny it. Nor would acknowledging the violence disparage the Government that the United States wishes to assist.

A second, more plausible explanation is numbers. There are only about 5,000 Poles affected by extended voluntary departure but probably 100,000 Salvadorans—or more. Not many Poles are able to sneak into this country to take advantage of the grant of temporary haven. But officials fear that a great many Salvadorans would try sneaking in if they became eligible for it, turning it into a de facto amnesty for illegals.

Perhaps so, but what does that have to do with peril? If El Salvador is dangerous, as the State Department reports in other contexts, then forcing Salvadorans to return home may subject them to danger and death. Why does the Reagan Administration err on the side of peril? Why not, temporarily, err on the side of safety? Why let Poles stay but not Salvadorans?

Fairness, not to mention humanity, calls for a better answer.●

#### BOOSTING SMALL BUSINESS AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, a major problem confronting our Nation's small business community during this period of continued high interest rates is how to raise capital for modernization and expansion.

As another step in seeking to enhance the capital formation opportunities for small business, I have co-sponsored H.R. 2566 which would require small business representation on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In support of that legislation, today I presented a statement for the record to the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Following is the text of that statement, which I hope will broaden understanding of the current needs and concerns of the small business community that is so vital to our Nation's economic well-being:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished Colleagues for this opportunity to express my views on H.R. 2566 and to impart some underlying observations concerning this proposal to include small business and agricultural representatives on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In view of the fact that other Members will specifically discuss the need for agricultural representation, I will confine my remarks to the importance of small business representation generally.

As chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, I have attempted to develop measures designed to

enhance small business capital formation both externally and internally. Pursuant to these efforts, I have become increasingly aware of the critical importance of small firms to the job generation process and technological innovation of this country.

In order to ensure that the small business community is able to perform its proper function in the future economic vitality of our Nation, it is essential to understand the unique problems faced by small business in raising necessary capital. Specifically, small business has traditionally been denied access to commercial paper and bond markets and has consistently relied on commercial bank credit as a key source of credit financing. In fact, a survey of bankers by the Interagency Task Force on Small Business Finance indicates that small firms obtain approximately 70% of their credit from commercial banks. With small business often paying two to three percentage points above prime, the high rate of interest rates of the last few years have been prohibitive to small business capital access.

Cognizant of the economic reality of small business' interest rate sensitivity, I have held numerous investigatory hearings on the impact of interest rates on small business capital formation. As a result of my early efforts regarding this issue, my Subcommittee prepared a report detailing the effects of Federal Reserve Monetary Policy on small business. One of the salient recommendations to surface from this effort was that the Congress should endeavor "to ensure that the Federal Reserve conduct monetary policy in a manner which will minimize the negative effects such policies may have on small business."

This proposition, I believe, is still well-founded. While admittedly, the country has embarked on the road to economic resurgence, we must keep in mind that many economists contend that the rekindling of this Nation's economic spark was initially spurred, in large degree, by the relaxation of the tight monetary policy of the Federal Reserve in the fall of 1982. The result of this action was a moderate reduction in interest rates still historically high when viewed from the "real" interest rate perspective. These positive signals of economic growth should be closely scrutinized, especially in view of the fact that the Federal Reserve may be unable or unwilling to take the initiative through monetary policy adjustment to check a future resurgence of interest rates resulting from a clash between the present and projected Federal deficit and increase in business' borrowing demands. A return to high and volatile interest rates could wreak havoc on the already tenuous capital access position of small business.

Therefore, the proposal before us today to require small business representation on the Federal Reserve Board would be a tremendous boost in the continuing struggle to maintain an affordable flow of funds to the small business community.

Another area of vital concern to small business and its relationship to credit access is the revolution occurring in the financial services industry and the evolution of bank deregulation.

In my capacity as Chairman of the Subcommittee, I have held hearings to investigate the impact of these trends on small business financing. As these financial developments occur it is essential that those of us concerned with the economic health of small business closely monitor these changes concentrating on achieving a bal-

anced plan of financial deregulation which recognizes the special credit needs of small firms.

It should be noted that witnesses and others have expressed fears concerning the effect of the present and projected bank deregulation on the ability of small firms to maintain an adequate flow of capital.

One of the most frequently mentioned difficulties in assessing the impact of the deregulation scenario on small business is a lack of sufficient data regarding small business loan practices. In order to effectuate sound policy and the future viability of small business credit, we must institute procedures to develop a sound data base on small business financing.

Another source of small business apprehension concerning bank deregulation is the disappearance of the small community-based banks which could result from the elimination of interstate banking restrictions. Many small business advocates claim community-based banks are in a better position to service small firms' credit needs due to the fact that they personally know the business applicant and the particular nuances of the community in which he or she operates.

These innovations in financial products, locations and services have caused alarm not only in the small business community, but throughout the financial community as a whole. For example, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul A. Volcker and Treasury Secretary Donald T. Regan, at a recent Senate Banking Committee hearing in Salt Lake City, urged Congress to act immediately to restore some semblance of order to the existing state of turmoil in the financial services industry.

In view of this erratic transformation in the financial community, and the lack of data concerning small business credit, it becomes increasingly urgent that the interests of small business be represented at the Federal Reserve as well as other policy making bodies.

In conclusion, let me point out that in these times of economic uncertainty and financial instability, we must prevent an economic scenario which could threaten irreparable harm to our small business sector. In addition, I would like to commend Mr. Mavroules for introducing this measure and my other colleagues who have consistently attempted to implement proposals on behalf of the small business community, the cornerstone of our Nation's economic stability.●

#### TRIBUTE TO CHET "CONKY" PRUSHINSKI

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the young people of the city of Nanticoke lost a great friend when Chet Prushinski died on October 30, 1983. For almost 40 years, Chet, whom everyone knew as "Conky," served as a volunteer trainer for the Nanticoke area football team. He taped the youngsters before each game; he tended to their minor injuries and, perhaps even



more important, he gave them advice and listened to their problems.

And so, on November 18, the Greater Nanticoke Area School Board renamed the fieldhouse at the John S. Fine High School. From now on, it will be known as the Conky Prushinski Fieldhouse in fitting tribute to a man who for two generations gave of himself to the kids of the Nanticoke area.

It was a fitting tribute to a great man, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy for the opportunity to share this significant event with my friends and colleagues in the House.●

## 25 YEARS OF FAVARH

### HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to draw attention to the fine work that is occurring in my district for developmentally disabled children, undertaken by a unique group of parents organized into the Farmington Valley Association for Retarded and Handicapped, Inc. (FAVARH). FAVARH is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year, and the success of this organization is a testimony to the power inherent in grassroots organizations and the valuable role they play in our community life. I think the following statement appropriately sums up the substantial accomplishments of a quarter of a decade of service to our Connecticut community and beyond.

#### TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF FAVARH

Parent Power is amazing. When parents work together to help their developmentally disabled children, wonderful things happen—sometimes beyond their expectations; like FAVARH (The Farmington Valley Association for Retarded & Handicapped, Inc.) as it is today.

One day in 1958 a parent who had a retarded youngster advertised in a local paper in Connecticut's Farmington Valley asking other parents to meet with her. Seven families responded. They met for support, strengthening each other to feel less lonely, less like outsiders. As discussions led to action, they discovered that together they possessed an important commodity that they lacked individually—POWER. From that nucleus which gradually linked with similar groups grew a movement, leading to state and then the national Association for Retarded Citizens. They were swept along on the tide of common purpose—fostering education, habilitation, and rehabilitation services for their family members, resulting in service agencies nationwide such as FAVARH.

Today, the agency offers an extensive range of services for developmentally disabled and physically handicapped persons and their families.

FAVARH's Adult Vocational Program includes a Clerical Bindery, an Industrial Workshop and a Food Service Program in its own 125 seat restaurant.

A vocational rehabilitation department conducts in-depth evaluation and career exploration, and places clients each year in positions in private business and industry.

An extended counseling program pairs counselors with clients on a one-to-one basis, with the ongoing goal of helping clients to learn more about themselves.

Family counseling is also a vital part of the overall program. Project COPE, Concerned Outreach to Parents of Exceptional Children, assists parents of newborn or newly diagnosed developmentally disabled and physically handicapped children. Family counseling is available for those parents needing to examine their feelings and solve problems that arise as their children grow to adulthood.

FAVARH currently provides residential opportunity for six mentally retarded adults in its group home. It can also help locate independent or supervised apartments for appropriately qualified participants.

Now with silver in our hair and some tough battles and success stories for our base we are forging ahead with new programs aimed at maximizing the emotional, mental, physical and social potential of those here in the Valley who need us. We anticipate the challenge of the next 25 years as we glance back and realize what individual courage can overcome when sustained and marshaled through the support of friends.●

## THE FUTURE UNDER PRESIDENT REAGAN

### HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, last night we were given a glimpse of the future as President Reagan sees it, as he proposes to shape it if he is elected to a second term in the White House.

I find it somewhat ironic that while younger men seeking the Presidency have murky, often gloomy visions of our present and future, our incumbent President is the only candidate who has a clear, positive, and progressive view of where we are going and where we can go.

President Reagan has proposed setting up a manned space station, for example, at an estimated cost of \$8 to \$12 billion over several years. This would be a boon to all mankind—we all know how our investment in the space program under President Kennedy benefited us beyond our wildest hopes.

But the President's younger, supposedly future-oriented opponents have attacked the space station proposal. Why, Mr. Mondale even led the opposition to the space shuttle while he was in the Senate. To his credit, Senator GLENN agrees with the President on the space station question, but he is the exception rather than the rule.

Throughout last night's speech and his term of office, Ronald Reagan has backed fresh ideas for the future—from enterprise zones to tax indexing,

from the line-item veto to space-based defense systems.

The present is great under President Reagan. America is back and getting better. The future can only improve if the President is allowed to turn 4 great years into 8 great years.●

## UNDERSTANDING ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, each year 2 million people in the United States contract Alzheimer's disease. Five percent of our senior citizens suffer from it. Yet few people understand how this disease, for which there is no cure, affects its victims and their families.

Glenn and Grace Kirkland, a Bethesda, Md. couple, are the subjects of a documentary on Alzheimer's disease, "Living With Grace," which will air in April on Public Broadcasting System stations throughout the country.

In anticipation of the showing of this film, Lon Rains has written a touching article about Alzheimer's disease and the Kirklands. His article appeared in this morning's Washington Post and I believe it is must reading for every American. I also hope that all of us will view "Living With Grace."

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1984]

#### INSIDE AN ALZHEIMER'S FAMILY

#### FILM DOCUMENTS A BETHESDA COUPLE'S STRUGGLE WITH DISEASE

(By Lon Rains)

A woman stands in her kitchen staring with growing agitation at a frying pan filled with hamburgers. She knows she can cook but somehow cannot remember what to do.

In frustration and anger, she cries out for her husband, asking him whether it is time for breakfast or dinner and what she is supposed to do.

As members of a camera crew move in and out of the picture to offer assistance, Glenn Kirkland patiently soothes his wife and completes the task for her.

Grace Kirkland, 73, who once would have handled a pan of hamburgers with skill and pleasure, is a victim of Alzheimer's disease, which is robbing her of memory. Household chores can be a frustrating experience for the Kirklands, Bethesda residents who are the focus of an award-winning documentary called "Living With Grace." It was filmed last summer by William A. Whiteford and Susan Hattery Cohen of the Department of Physical Therapy at the University of Maryland School of Medicine in Baltimore.

"Living With Grace" won the grand prize at the International Rehabilitation Film Festival in New York three months ago, competing against 200 entries. A precious winner of the festival, sponsored for seven years by the U.S. branch of the Rehabilitation International organization, was "Ele-

phant Man," which also won an Academy Award.

"Living With Grace" will be shown April 30 on Public Broadcasting System stations.

Glenn Kirkland, 65, who is a shy and retiring physicist at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, said that at first he declined to make the film. But he later agreed to this invasion of their private lives because, as president of the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association of Baltimore and Central Maryland, he knew that it was useful for the public to learn about Alzheimer's.

A native of Atlanta and a former Treasury Department clerk who has lived in this area since 1945, Grace Kirkland raised a daughter, Evelyn Smith, and has two grandchildren. She was once a skilled cook and seamstress who loved to cook for company and make her own clothes and bridesmaid gowns for friends. She also sang in her church choir. She never had been seriously ill.

After meeting her, Whiteford and Cohen said, they knew they wanted to make her the subject of their documentary. "We just fell in love with her," Cohen said.

But the filming was not easy for the crew or for the Kirklands.

"It was a very emotional experience," Whiteford said. "Initially it was very uncomfortable. But we began to establish a rapport and she began to know us."

Alzheimer's disease affects more than 2 million people a year in the United States. Although sometimes identified as "senility," Alzheimer's is not the fading of memory that often comes with age, but a progressive, incurable degeneration of the brain. Other signs include loss of short-term memory, confusion, bizarre behavior and, eventually total dependency.

While Alzheimer's occasionally affects those in middle age, it is far more prevalent among the elderly. The disease affects 5 percent of those over 65 and 10 percent of those over 80, the film-makers said.

With 12 hours of videotape in hand to make their 30-minute documentary, Whiteford and Cohen decided to take a nontraditional approach: Rather than integrate footage of the Kirklands with facts, statistics and statements from professionals, they chose to portray Alzheimer's from the victim's perspective.

Every scene in the film focuses on Grace as she tries to cope with her loss of memory. She works word puzzle games and visits a day-care center, her doctor and her grandchildren. Following the Kirklands through the events of one summer, the film focuses on the confusion and frustration that characterize the existence of an Alzheimer's victim existence.

"Grace knows that something is wrong with her but she does not know what, and it gets her flustered and embarrassed," her husband said. In one scene she exhibits loud and seemingly drunken behavior—typical of those who suffer the disease—while watching a magician perform at Baltimore's Inner Harbor.

"Actually, she is just a very beautiful person. By portraying Grace as she is, we hope people will understand that it is important to help people like Grace," Whiteford said.

But "Living With Grace" also focuses on Glenn Kirkland's role. Although his wife's moods change abruptly and without warning, he remains a calm and steadying influence.

"He never reacts to her on an emotional level," Cohen said. "He uses distraction as a

management technique almost to perfection."

Glenn Kirkland said that there is little point in getting upset with an Alzheimer's victim. "But I have to force myself to stay on an even keel when she says and does things that would normally upset me," he said.

"It gets frustrating, but I try to turn problems into challenges to see how I can implant my idea in her so she won't get embarrassed. Sometimes we just spell out words together or I will make up a song we can sing to remember it."

The impact of Alzheimer's disease can be as devastating for the victim's family as it is for the victim. As the disease advances—it can take up to 12 years—victims eventually lose the ability to take care of themselves. Full-time care is expensive and is not usually covered by medical insurance, Kirkland said.

"I will probably have to retire early," he said. "I am anxious that we stay together as a family. You would think that this would cause families to break up, but it makes marriages much tighter. I have seen a lot of people showing great love for one another."

"People in our age bracket seem to have a different attitude than the younger generation. Our marriage vows said 'for better or worse, in sickness and in health.' It never occurs to us that it should by any other way."

As an official of an Alzheimer's Association chapter, Kirkland said that he is in frequent contact with families of other victims. He said that one of the reasons he agreed to do the documentary was to help people understand the difficulty and challenge that the families face.

"Frequently, a 'care-giver' is ostracized—just as the victim is. The general public just does not understand. Friends and acquaintances float away and you find yourself becoming isolated," Kirkland said.

For all that has happened, he considers himself a lucky man. "When I visit others [with Alzheimer's] I get a preview of coming attractions, but I cannot let that worry me. I will worry when the time comes."

"I am very fortunate that she has all of her capabilities—we can walk together and still talk together. I am just delighted that she is no further along. It hurts, but no more than if she had cancer or heart trouble."

Kirkland said that he and his wife have not been isolated. When Grace had eye surgery last year, friends and family rallied to their support. Nearly a dozen women from the Kirklands' church went to their home, cleaned the rooms, and washed, mended and pressed clothes.

Church remains an important part of their lives, Kirkland said. They attend services each Sunday at the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Bethesda. "I am convinced the Lord knows what he is doing," Kirkland observed. "Although I do not understand why, I just have to find out what he is teaching us."

In the closing moments of the film, Grace Kirkland is sitting in a front pew. She is surrounded by friends who join the choir in singing an old, familiar hymn. "Amazing grace, how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me . . ."

And Grace Kirkland wipes away a tear. ●

## A NEW COURSE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, with the recent recommendation for increased aid to El Salvador, Mr. Reagan's attempt to eliminate human rights certification, and the announcement that the military will stage another powerful extravaganza in Honduras next summer, it is clear that the administration has learned nothing from its lack of progress in Central America.

I commend to my colleagues' attention an analysis of this no-win situation by Mr. Wayne Smith, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The article appeared in the New York Times last fall.

### NEEDED IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Wayne S. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan's approach in Central America brings to mind an image of a man long accustomed to driving nails who is given the opportunity to use a screw. Ignoring the more sophisticated option, he just keeps banging away and calling for a bigger hammer—and blaming Congress when his pounding doesn't work. Mr. Reagan's "secret" war against Nicaragua has accomplished nothing. It has not interdicted a single rifle. Certainly it has no chance of getting rid of the Sandinistas. On the contrary, by providing a external threat against which they can rally the Nicaraguan people, it may have helped them more than it has harmed them. Yet, the President is determined to go on with it.

He also clearly intends to press on for a military victory in El Salvador—even though the chances of success are slight without the eventual expenditure of United States blood as well as treasure.

A far more promising approach would be built around multilateral diplomacy. It could be based principally on the Contadora process, although not necessarily limited to it. The aim would be to produce verifiable and enforceable accords (enforced by an international peacekeeping force, if necessary) that would end all activity by one country in support of guerrillas operating against a second, limit arms and armies and reduce foreign military involvement.

Meanwhile, negotiations should begin in El Salvador, possibly under international supervision and aimed at bringing about an immediate cease-fire and then conditions for really meaningful elections in which all sides could participate. If the left is to lay down its arms before elections, so must the right-wing death squads. There must be give and take on both sides—and since neither would trust the other to oversee an electoral process, they would have to work out some way to share the responsibility. The Administration rejects this as "power-sharing." In fact, it would be a perfectly reasonable arrangement if the limits of the shared mandate were made absolutely clear—to oversee a political process culminating in elections.



But the Administration has no intention of trying a diplomatic approach. It insists, for public relations purposes, that it favors negotiations, while doing everything it can to avoid them. The proof is in what it does, not in what it says. It says, for example, that it supports the Contadora process. Yet representatives of the Contadora countries—Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Colombia—have stated openly that the Administration is undermining their efforts.

And what of the Cuban and Nicaraguan proposals for negotiations put forward in July? They are far from perfect, but they do address several of our key concerns, including the halting of support for guerrillas and the withdrawal of foreign advisers. At the very least, they seemed to offer a useful first step in a negotiating process. Did we open such negotiations? Of course not. President Reagan said Fidel Castro's proposals were "encouraging" and Secretary of State George P. Shultz assured Congressional leaders that they would be thoroughly explored. But that was the end of it. Less than 10 days later, President Reagan dismissed the Cuban proposal as "not serious" and made it clear that we had no intention of discussing them. The Nicaraguan proposals received even shorter shrift: Mr. Reagan responded almost immediately that there was little hope of a regional settlement so long as the Sandinistas were in power.

Nor, predictably, have contacts with the Salvadoran opposition produced anything useful. They could not, for the Administration and the Salvadoran Government continue to insist that the only thing there is to talk about is the opposition's participation in a political process organized and overseen exclusively by the Government. Not being fools, the opposition will never agree to that.

Why is the Administration avoiding serious negotiations in Central America? Largely because it believes that talks might get in the way of its real objectives—to get rid of the Sandinista Government one way or another and to force a military victory in El Salvador. By the time the Administration realizes that neither of these goals is achievable and that its policies are leading toward a dangerous dead end, it will probably be too late. We will already have a regional conflagration on our hands.

What's needed in Central America is diplomacy, but the Reagan Administration has shown no sign that it is capable of competent diplomacy. It has no durable diplomatic achievement to its credit—not in the South Atlantic, not in the Middle East, not in Namibia. Why should Central America be any different? ●

**FOUNTAIN VALLEY BOARD OF REALTORS HONORS OUTGOING PRESIDENT NANCY RHYME**

**HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1984, the Huntington Beach—Fountain Valley Board of Realtors will honor its outgoing 1983 president, Nancy Rhyme.

As president of the board, Nancy has demonstrated her outstanding com-

mitment to the real estate industry and provided leadership for the 1,500 members of this board, which is one of the largest boards in the State of California.

During her presidency, the board has been an active participant in community activities, working on such important issues as the revision of the county housing element, initiation of redevelopment in the city of Huntington Beach, and sponsorship of a successful community carnival which raised \$11,500 for the Paramedics units in the cities of Huntington Beach and Fountain Valley.

Nancy has also overseen an increase in services for members of the board, including implementation of a new "high-tech" computerized MLS system, a restructuring of the professional standards manual, and initiation of an ombudsman program to assist consumers with real estate related questions.

She has represented the board members at the State level at meetings of the California Association of Realtors, and at the national level at meetings of the National Association of Realtors.

Nancy has been an active realtor for more than 10 years, and is currently a broker associate with real estate by McVay. She is a director of the California Association of Realtors, a member of the RPAC "99 Club," serves on the Board's Government and Political Affairs Committee, and is a BORPAC trustee.

As the Congressman representing the Huntington Beach—Fountain Valley area, I take great pride in commending Nancy Rhyme on a job well done and wish her a most successful future. ●

**MARITIME POLICY FOR 1984**

**HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the 1980 campaign, President Reagan promised to pursue a maritime policy to "reestablish the U.S. flag commercial fleet as an effective economic instrument to support U.S. interests abroad." At the time he indicated that this policy would include a unified Navy-merchant marine shipbuilding program, that he would maintain a strong shipbuilding base and that he would insure that U.S. ships carry an equitable portion of our foreign trade. Unfortunately, these promises have not yet been translated into reality.

Since 1981 the state of our shipbuilding industry and our U.S.-flag merchant marine has declined, not improved. This is having an impact not only on the maritime sector of our

economy; it is seriously affecting our defense posture as well.

Lee Rice, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, provides a serious evaluation of President Reagan's maritime policy in a year-end newsletter. The text of his comments follows:

**MARITIME POLICY ADRIPT**

At the beginning of 1983 the domestic shipbuilding and ship repair industries were in overall rapid decline. It was deemed improbable, even then, that the capacity and capability of the industries was sufficient to meet the requirements which would be imposed by mobilization and a major war. These facts and conclusions were not the result of labored analyses held in the secret councils of the government. They were known to anyone reasonably knowledgeable of the status of these industries and the requirements which would be imposed by mobilization and the demands which would occur during a war.

Paralleling the loss of capability and capacity of the domestic shipyard mobilization base was the predictable future rapid decline of the sealift capacity of the nation. Even limited analysis by those knowledgeable about the status of the international shipping industry and the ability of U.S. flag operators to compete and be able to expand or renew their fleets indicated that sharp reduction in the size of the operating fleets was likely. This reduction will cause a contraction in the pool of available manpower which would be required to crew vessels in time of national emergency. Further, projection of the commercial demand for militarily useful tanker tonnage into the next decade indicated that this fleet would be smaller than required to meet national security needs.

The nation and its leaders had been shown by the British campaign in the Falklands that both naval and commercial shipping is needed to protect vital interests. This is particularly true when defined vital interests may not be in concert with those either of allies or other nations whose support and maritime assets may be essential for use in the pursuit of national interests.

During 1983, broad-ended discussion of maritime needs occurred in the Congress and in the deliberations of numerous groups of citizens active in maritime affairs. That the problem must be faced and solutions found was a universal conclusion whenever the innate linkage between the national security and maritime power was debated. Indeed, studies conducted by the Administration concluded that sealift capacity was marginally inadequate and likely to decline and that the shipyard mobilization base could not support the tasks of mobilization and a major war.

Is it not reasonable, therefore, that the citizenry should have expected the Administration, which has espoused as basic policy the need for vigilant military preparedness and has consistently developed and supported defense budgets alleged to correct deficiencies in our military capability, would have directed that these problems be addressed and corrected?

Against this background, examine the Administration's actions and the policy initiatives which have been proposed.

Early in the year the Department of Transportation proposed that tanker vessels built with Construction-differential Subsidy and which were, in the main, chartered under long term commitments to interna-

tional petroleum companies be allowed to repay the unamortized portion of the construction subsidy by using government guaranteed loans and gain status as qualified Jones Act vessels. The Department admitted to the Congress that no consideration had been given to the national security implications of the proposed rule. Further, DOT stated to the Congress that if the rule caused a significant negative effect to the national security that the rule must be reconsidered as to its appropriateness. Shortly, after the completion of hearings in the House of Representatives on the proposed rule, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Thayer wrote to Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole stating that the rule would cause significant harm to the national security. The position of the DOD was that the rule would reduce both the shipyard mobilization base and the number of militarily useful tankers. Yet, at present, the rule is still under active consideration for implementation and is strongly advocated by certain officials within the Department of Transportation.

In midyear, the Administration proposed to the Congress that vessel operators holding Operating-differential Subsidy contracts be given the permanent right to retain these contracts and to be able to purchase vessels abroad. Further, it was proposed that the ad valorem duty on foreign repairs on U.S. flag vessels be eliminated and thus remove an important underpinning of the domestic ship repair industry. Other initiatives sought in the legislation included the use of tax deferred CCF monies to finance the purchase of foreign built vessels, the immediate ability of foreign purchased U.S. flag vessels to carry preference cargos and a major increase in the allowable ownership of U.S. flag vessels by foreign nationals. Thus, in these initiatives the Department of Transportation proposed that the domestic capability to build commercial vessels be abandoned beyond Jones Act demand. Ironically, this very demand will be effectively eliminated for many years due to the over-tonnaging of the trade which will occur if the CDS repayment scheme is implemented.

Throughout the latter half of the year the potential that Alaskan crude oil would be allowed to be exported to Japan and other Pacific Rim countries was under active consideration within the Administration. Once again, little, if any, consideration was given to the loss of business to domestic shipyards and the resulting negative effect on the national security. Also, the fact that the proposal would result in the layup or scrapping of many handy size tankers has been ignored.

To the dismay of the maritime community, the Department of Transportation announced that even though existing law required otherwise, cargos shipped under the Department of Agriculture's blended credit program would not be required to be shipped under the cargo preference law because compliance with the law would frustrate the plan under which this program was to operate. Thus, the Administration chose to flout compliance with existing law. Again, national security was sacrificed to other objectives.

In a further action, the Department of Transportation published proposed guidelines under which the holders of Operating-differential Subsidy contracts could terminate these contracts in exchange for prepayments by the government of future obligations. No showing that such actions would have a positive effect on the national security

was made. Indeed, no test that at least the national security would not be harmed was even proposed.

As we have stated repeatedly throughout 1983, there exists an obvious and highly dangerous void in policy development. The policy actions cited above clearly demonstrate that a dichotomy of purpose exists within the Administration. The President is, of course, responsible for both the national security and the development of effective maritime policy. He alone remains responsible because no delegation of authority has been made.

What is most disconcerting about this void in policy development is that we live in a very unstable and volatile world. Indeed, 1983 witnessed heightened international tensions between the United States, the Soviet Union and her satellite states. Nuclear arms limitation talks were broken off in Geneva. The conflict in Lebanon continues and ongoing direct involvement using military forces of the United States has been recently reaffirmed by the President. Finally, closer to home, the rescue operation in Grenada was carried out, and it remains highly probable that the Caribbean Basin will remain unstable. Seapower will remain a high priority and a vitally needed resource.

The fundamental question is whether or not the President, having stated so strongly and positively his support for the industry as a vital element of national security during the 1980 presidential campaign, is aware of the detrimental effect of the actions of his Administration or the growing threat to national security which they represent. We continue in our belief that he does not. We cannot believe that this situation would continue if the President knew how dangerous the present course has become. This view is supported by the strong advocacy by the President for the need to continue the program to rebuild and maintain the strength and capability of the Navy. We support completely the President's policies in regard to the Navy, but find these deficient and too narrow to meet present and future overall security needs.

1984 will be a new year. Will it finally mark the beginning of the fulfillment of the promises of candidate Reagan given in 1980? Time is short for the initiation of actions to reduce the risks to the nation caused by failures of the past.

Let us begin the New Year with the resolve that we will continue to insist that our message cannot be ignored.

M. LEE RICE,  
President.

In addition to Mr. Rice's critique of the current state of our maritime policy, I would also like to share an article from the current issue of Sea Power magazine entitled "The Challenge of Soviet Shipping." This article describes what steps the Soviet Union is taking to expand its merchant fleet. It provides a graphic commentary on the need for this administration to adopt and implement a positive maritime policy for the United States.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET SHIPPING

(By Edwin M. Hood)

The Soviet merchant marine, by almost every standard of measurement, has now surpassed the U.S.-flag shipping fleet. In tonnage it stands sixth on the world scale, ranking well ahead of the United States, and indications are that the enlargement of

Russian seafight capabilities will continue indefinitely.

"How is it that Russia, whose shipbuilding and shipping industries are less technically advanced and commercially efficient than Western shipbuilding and shipping, have expanded to a point where their carrying capacity is considerably more than twice what they need for the carriage of their overseas liner trade?"

That rhetorical question is posed by Sir Ronald Swayne, former chairman of Overseas Containers Ltd., on the first page of a new collection of informative essays on *The Challenge of Soviet Shipping*, published by the National Strategy Information Center (NSIC) in New York in association with Aims of Industry, a London-based organization. The NSIC/Aims publication includes a number of timely reports and commentaries by maritime authorities in the United States and overseas who collectively argue for restraints—quotas, revenue/cargo ceilings, "equalization taxes," countervailing duties, or licensing—on Russian participation in cross trades (which never touch Soviet ports) between Free World countries. In the absence of such restraints, says Swayne, "the damage to Western shipping will become increasingly serious."

Swiss journalist Jurg Dedial, in his essay "The Threat of the Soviet Merchant Fleet," notes that "the Soviet merchant fleet has succeeded in cutting deeply into what was once the private preserve of Western lines." For example, he writes, in recent times Soviet shipping carried 13 percent of the general cargo between the United States and Western Europe and 25 percent of the goods traffic between the United States and Germany. Moreover, in the "highly profitable" trade between the U.S. West Coast and the Far East, the Vladivostok-based FESCO (Far East Shipping Co.) "has risen rapidly to clearly dominate a field of 24 competing firms, with a 23 percent lead in sales volume over its nearest competitor." At one point, vessels flying the hammer and sickle were observed in more than 70 U.S. ports, and only the refusal of U.S. longshoremen to handle Russian vessels in early 1980 and again in 1983 has slowed this disturbing and disruptive trend.

Unrealistic pricing—reflecting communist-state vs. market-economy-state philosophies—accounts in large part for what Swayne calls the opportunistic Soviet undermining of the price structure "in any trade in which the Russians seriously operate." Soviet ship deployments follow no consistent pattern and seem to be dictated more by political developments rather than by commercial considerations—rates 26 percent to 38 percent lower than so-called conference rates governing Free World shipping have been reported. Dedial describes this phenomenon as "a cutthroat rate policy that has shaken the structure of commercial shipping worldwide and in some places subjected it to severe pressure."

Sir Ronald, in his discerning introduction, states: "It is not enough to blame the Russians for subsidizing shipping services and undercutting us. We must understand how this is done." The real difficulty, he says, is the absence of a common economic language in which the various terms for profit and loss have the same meaning and are similarly calculated in both the Soviet Union and the Free World. It would appear, he adds, that "to some extent in their planning [the Soviets] attempt to quantify social, strategic, or other objectives" both in



the allocation of state funds and in computing the rate of return on those funds.

#### NO RELATION TO REALITY

Although real economic factors—high social costs, for example, offset by the low cash wages endemic to the Soviet system—are probably factored in to some extent, a primary purpose of Soviet shipping services is to earn a maximum of foreign exchange. One result is that the USSR's "favourable balance of earnings on currency," as Sir Ronald points out, "bears no relation to accounts based on international parities, and Western methods of accounting."

The strategic and political motivations for expanding the Russian Navy, merchant marine, fishing fleet, and research fleet to global range also are touched on in Challenge. Fleet Admiral Sergei G. Gorshkov has declared that "maritime transportation, fishing, and scientific research on the sea are part of the Soviet Union's naval might." His thinking is obviously in lockstep with Mahan's and there are, in fact, a growing number of experts who believe that the collective strengths of the Soviet and U.S. naval and other fleets are today roughly equivalent and that, in a larger context, the buildup of the various Soviet fleets is a high-priority factor in advancing the global strategy of the Kremlin.

In an essay on "The U.S. Longshoremen's Boycott," Rear Adm. William Mott, USN (Ret.), former Navy judge advocate general and now NSIC's vice president and general counsel, points to clear signs that "Soviet expansionism, using Cuban and East German surrogates, controlled by the USSR, seeks . . . to dominate and eventually take over southern Africa." Why? Another good question. In Adm. Mott's words: "There is an umbilical cord between control of littoral real estate and naval penetration."

The Soviet process of expansionism, Mott points out in another essay ("The Soviet Maritime Offensive"), evidently begins with the negotiation of fishing agreements—he says 23 are now in force—as a step toward attainment of needed ports, repair facilities, and land-based airfields. Angola on the Atlantic Ocean side of Africa and Mozambique on the Indian Ocean side are cited as examples of the new Soviet strategic presence in southern Africa. Mott notes sadly that, "The West, on the other hand, has no dry docks and no naval facilities on the African mainland."

Mott quotes, and emphasizes, Gorshkov's statement that the United States "imports fully or partly 69 of the 72 materials" without which U.S. industry and the U.S. military could not function. Equally foreboding is Gorshkov's additional point that "more than 99 percent of these materials are transported by sea." (And by other than U.S.-flag shipping.) In that context, the prospect of Soviet interdiction of shipping, to the subsequent detriment of U.S. national interests, is both plausible and chilling to contemplate.

#### SERIOUS NEGLECT BY THE WEST

These facts, unfortunately, seem to command only cursory attention in the councils of the U.S. government. There still has been no comprehensive long-range plan developed to neutralize what Dedial refers to as Soviet "political goals, such as the weakening of Western transport capacity and the extortionist creation of serious dependencies."

"Seen as a whole, the Soviet merchant marine is one of the few fleets capable of ef-

fectively pursuing both commercial and military objectives," the Swiss journalist also asserts. The great weakness of the West, in his view, "is to be found precisely in those areas where the Soviets are strongest: in organization and integration with the military apparatus."

Here is perhaps his most pertinent comment, however: "Since World War II the West has seriously neglected the use of civilian ship capacity for military purposes—though NATO is now working on a requisition plan which would permit it to mobilize 400 to 600 freighters in a very short time. But the Soviet Union, thanks to the strict, centralized organization of its merchant fleet, has a unified, quickly mobilizable apparatus at its disposal. Outwardly, the merchant fleet is under the jurisdiction of a separate ministry. But the construction of both military and civilian craft is controlled by the Ministry of Shipbuilding, and close links to the Foreign and Defense ministries ensure immediate availability of merchant vessels for missions of a political or military nature."

"By comparison," Mr. Dedial contends, "the West seems hopelessly disorganized. The example of the USA shows that there is hardly any harmonization of equipment between military and civilian fleets; in fact, rivalry between the various responsible authorities makes this almost impossible. The civilian Maritime Administration and the U.S. Navy . . . have spent years passing the buck to one another, when it comes to the responsibility for designing a credible strategy to counter the Soviet Union's maritime buildup."

The 10 authors represented in the NSIC/Aims publication provide an informative and reasonable well balanced appraisal of *The Challenge of Soviet Shipping*. Their major focus, however, seems to be on the commercial aspects of that challenge. In the closing essay, Dominique Peugniez, secretary general of the European Community's Committee of Shipowners' Associations, pleads for state support in dealing with Russian competition. He concludes with this hopeful remark: "We do not want a confrontation with the Soviets, but somehow we must arrive at a modus vivendi by which we can all compete freely and fairly."

There are few who would disagree with the desirability of obtaining that goal. There are, however, many who believe that the Soviet "shipping" challenge is much more than that, and provides such great benefits to the Soviet Navy, and to Soviet diplomacy, that attainment of any modus vivendi such as that so optimistically described will be impossible to achieve—freely, fairly, or otherwise. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE YOUNG PEOPLE IN NANTICOKE, PA.

##### HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear what is wrong with American youth. There is a lot that is right, too, but unfortunately that often escapes our attention.

I, therefore, rise today to acquaint my colleagues in the House with some very fine young people in Nanticoke, Pa., for an outstanding job which they

performed for their community on a very cold morning.

On Friday morning, November 25, there was a parade in Nanticoke bringing Santa Claus to town. For some time plans had been made for a military color guard but, at the last moment, that did not materialize. It looked for a short while as if the parade would have to march through the streets of Nanticoke without a color guard at the head.

Then four young men from Troop 410 of the Boys Scouts of America stepped into the breach. On a cold day and against a strong wind, these young men carried their Nation's colors proudly and well throughout the hilly line of march. And so I rise, today, to commend Thomas S. Dennis of 184 West Broad Street, Mike and Brian Garvey, both of 222 Enterprise Street, and Eric Grabowski of 129 Loomis Street, Nanticoke, for service above and beyond the call of duty. A similar recognition must go to their Scout master, Michael J. Karpinski, of 163 Park Street.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention as well my friend, Col. Frank G. Koronkiewicz, who was the marshal of that parade and two volunteers, Keith Holtslander and Eddie Bieda, who assisted him in organizing the line of march.

Thanks must go also to the parade cochairman, Brenda Jarolin and Sharon Walters Sheruda of the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce, who are responsible for putting the whole parade together. All of these people, Mr. Speaker, are examples to us of what a community, working together, can do. ●

#### MILITARY APPRECIATION DAY

##### HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, all across this land citizens of the United States of America appreciate the sacrifices of those among us who serve their country in time of war and peace. With this in mind, I would like to call the attention of this honorable body to an event in the 46th Congressional District on February 11, 1984.

This special occasion is known as Military Appreciation Day, and the citizens of my district in Orange County, Calif., have banded together to honor a number of outstanding young men and women who have served their country well in peacetime and several others who have received the Nation's highest honor for wartime service, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Honored at this event will be the "Sailor of the Year, Marine of the

Year, Coast Guardsman of the Year and Airman of the Year." At least four recipients of the Medal of Honor will be present for recognition of their selfless service in wartime.

The Newport Harbor Post No. 291 of the American Legion is responsible for this superb civic effort for our veterans and men and women in uniform. Elected public officials throughout Orange County are joining me in this salute to our men and women, plus top rank commanders of military units which are based in the area in and around the 40th District.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, who has spent countless hours visiting military installations at home and around the world, talking to our people in uniform, I have the utmost respect and admiration for those who have chosen to serve their country in our Nation's armed services.

I salute Newport Beach American Legion Post No. 291 for their efforts in bringing our Nation's service men and women and our past heroes together on February 11.●

#### THE 1984 ELECTION YEAR MAILING RESTRICTIONS

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, with the 1984 election year upon us, the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards wishes to remind Members of the House about the franking statutes, rules, and regulations governing mass mailings by candidates prior to elections.

Generally, Members of the House seeking reelection are prohibited from sending franked mass mailings during the 60-day period immediately before the date of any public election—whether primary, general, special, or runoff—in which the Member's name appears on the ballot.

Further, any Member who is a candidate for other public office may not frank mass mailings outside of the congressional district from which the Member was elected, beginning at the time the Member is certified for candidacy.

Members should ensure that staff persons responsible for mass mailings are knowledgeable concerning State election laws as they affect mailing privileges during the period prior to primary and general election periods. Members' staff seeking advisory opinions from the Commission must certify that, to the best of their knowledge, the frankability of the proposed mailing is not adversely affected by applicable State election laws.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of

compliance with these regulations. I urge my colleagues to insure that their staffs are familiar with the statutes, rules of the House, and pertinent regulations and guidelines governing the proper use of the franking privilege.

The Commission staff is ready to assist in every possible way.

A detailed explanation of the mass mailing provisions, along with a listing of cutoff dates for the congressional primaries in the various States, follows:

#### LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF THE FRANK BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(6)(A) provides that, "it is the intent of Congress that a Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress may not mail any mass mailing as franked mail—

(i) if the mass mailing is mailed fewer than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary election or general election (whether regular, special or runoff) in which the Member is a candidate for reelection; or

(ii) in the case of a Member of, or Member-elect to, the House who is a candidate for any other public office, if the mass mailing—

(I) is prepared for delivery within any portion of the jurisdiction of or the area covered by the public office which is outside the area constituting the congressional district from which the Member or Member-elect was elected to; or

(II) is mailed fewer than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary election or general election (whether regular, special or runoff) in which the Member-elect is a candidate for any other public office.

Mailings made through the facilities of the Publications Distribution Service of the House of Representatives (House folding room) shall be deemed in compliance with this statute if such mailings are delivered to the House folding room not less than 62 days before the date of such election, with instructions for immediate dispatch.

#### DEFINITIONS

##### Mass mailings

Mass mailings are defined by law [39 U.S.C. 3210 (a)(5)(D)] as newsletters and other similar mailings (including town meeting notices) of more than 500 pieces in which the content of the matter mailed is substantially identical. Mail matter is deemed to be a mass mailing when the total number of pieces exceeds 500, whether in a single mailing or in cumulative mailings during the 60-day period.

##### Candidate for election or reelection to the House of Representatives

For purposes of the subject statutes and regulations, a Member of or a Member-elect to the House of Representatives is deemed to be a candidate for public office at any election if his or her name appears anywhere on any official ballot to be used in a public election.

##### Candidate for "any other public office"

For the purpose of 39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(6)(A)(ii), "any other public office" means any local, State, or Federal office. (Examples: President, Governor, U.S. Senator, State Supreme Court Justice, State Senator, Assemblyman, etc.) "Candidate" means a Member who has qualified under State or local law for the official ballot in a primary, runoff, special, or general election, or who has been certified for candidacy by

an appropriate State or local election official.

#### EXCEPTIONS

The subject statutes, rules, and regulations provide three exceptions to the mass mail prohibition prior to elections, as follows:

(i) mailings which are in direct response to inquiries or requests from the persons to whom the matter is mailed;

(ii) mailings to colleagues in Congress or to government officials (whether Federal, State, or local); and

(iii) mailings of news releases to the communications media.

The Commission believes the latter two exceptions are self-explanatory.

In application of the first exception, the Commission stresses the phrase "direct response to inquiries or requests". Therefore, response to a signed petition with a form or identical letter individually addressed to each of the signers of the petition is frankable. However, a follow-up letter to the same list of petitioners is not frankable under this section in that it would not be in direct response to an inquiry.

Similarly, follow-up letters to persons who had previously written and had been answered on a particular subject, if such letters by their form and volume constitute a mass mailing, are not frankable during the 60-day period prior to elections. Also, requests for questionnaire results or other material, when solicited by Members on questionnaire forms or newsletters, are not deemed to be in direct response to any inquiry or request.

The above restrictions on mass mailings by candidates do not apply to mass mailings by the chairman of any standing, select, joint or other official committee of the Congress, or subcommittee thereof, and which relate to the normal business of the committee. [39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(6)(B)]

#### TIME OF MAILING

##### Processing by a postal facility

Mass mailings as defined under 39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(5)(D) may not be mailed as franked mail by a Member of or a Member-elect to the House of Representatives when the same is mailed at or delivered to any postal facility other than the Publications Distribution Service of the House of Representatives, hereinafter referred to as the House folding room, less than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary or general election (whether regular, special, or runoff) in which such Member or Member-elect is a candidate for any public office.

##### Processing by the House folding room

Such mass mailings, if processed through the House folding room, shall be deemed to be in compliance with the subject rule and these regulations, if delivered to the House folding room, with instructions for immediate dispatch, not less than 62 days immediately before the date of any such election. In the case of mass mailings delivered to the House folding room prior to the 62 day cutoff period, the requirement of instructions for "immediate dispatch" may be modified to the extent that instructions are given for delivery of the mailing to the addressee not later than the 60th day immediately before the date of such election.

The House folding room shall issue a receipt, which shall specify the date and time of delivery and a brief description of the matter to be processed, to the Member at the time he or she delivers such mass mailings to the House folding room.



1984 CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY DATES—CHRONOLOGICAL  
LIST BY ELECTION DATES

State	Primary date	60-day cutoff (Postal facility)	62-day cutoff (Folding room)
Illinois	Mar. 20	Jan. 20	Jan. 18
Pennsylvania	Apr. 10	Feb. 10	Feb. 8
District of Columbia	May 1	Mar. 2	Feb. 29
Texas	May 5	Mar. 6	Mar. 4
Indiana	May 8	Mar. 9	Mar. 7
Maryland	do	do	Do.
North Carolina	do	do	Do.
Ohio	do	do	Do.
Nebraska	May 15	Mar. 16	Mar. 14
Oregon	do	do	Do.
Idaho	May 22	Mar. 23	Mar. 21
Arkansas	May 29	Mar. 30	Mar. 28
California	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Iowa	do	do	Do.
Mississippi	do	do	Do.
Montana	do	do	Do.
New Jersey	do	do	Do.
New Mexico	do	do	Do.
South Dakota	do	do	Do.
West Virginia	do	do	Do.
Maine	June 12	Apr. 13	Apr. 11
North Dakota	do	do	Do.
South Carolina	do	do	Do.
Virginia	do	do	Do.
Tennessee	Aug. 2	June 3	June 1
Kansas	Aug. 7	June 8	June 6
Michigan	do	do	Do.
Missouri	do	do	Do.
Georgia	Aug. 14	June 15	June 13
Utah	Aug. 21	June 22	June 20
Alaska	Aug. 28	June 29	June 27
Kentucky	do	do	Do.
Oklahoma	do	do	Do.
Guam	Sept. 1	July 3	July 1
Alabama	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
Florida	do	do	Do.
Nevada	do	do	Do.
Delaware	Sept. 8	July 10	July 8
Arizona	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Colorado	do	do	Do.
Connecticut	do	do	Do.
Minnesota	do	do	Do.
New Hampshire	do	do	Do.
New York	do	do	Do.
Rhode Island	do	do	Do.
Vermont	do	do	Do.
Virgin Islands	do	do	Do.
Wisconsin	do	do	Do.
Wyoming	do	do	Do.
Massachusetts	Sept. 18	July 20	July 18
Washington	do	do	Do.
Hawaii	Sept. 22	July 24	July 22
Louisiana	Sept. 29	July 31	July 29
1984 general election	Nov. 6	Sept. 7	Sept. 5

Note: The 60-day and 62-day cutoff regulations also apply to runoff elections in which the Member is a candidate.

1984 CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY DATES—ALPHABETICAL  
LIST BY STATE

State	Primary date	60-day cutoff (Postal facility)	62-day cutoff (Folding room)
Alabama	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
Alaska	Aug. 28	June 29	June 27
Arizona	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Arkansas	May 29	Mar. 30	Mar. 28
California	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Colorado	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Connecticut	do	do	Do.
Delaware	Sept. 8	July 10	July 8
Florida	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
Georgia	Aug. 14	June 15	June 13
Hawaii	Sept. 22	July 24	July 22
Idaho	May 22	Mar. 23	Mar. 21
Illinois	Mar. 20	Jan. 20	Jan. 18
Indiana	May 8	Mar. 9	Mar. 7
Iowa	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Kansas	Aug. 7	June 8	June 6
Kentucky	Aug. 28	June 29	June 27
Louisiana	Sept. 29	July 31	July 29
Maine	June 12	Apr. 13	Apr. 11
Maryland	May 8	Mar. 9	Mar. 7
Massachusetts	Sept. 18	July 20	July 18
Michigan	Aug. 7	June 8	June 6
Minnesota	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Mississippi	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Missouri	Aug. 7	June 8	June 6
Montana	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Nebraska	May 15	Mar. 16	Mar. 14
Nevada	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
New Hampshire	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
New Jersey	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
New Mexico	do	do	Do.
New York	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
North Carolina	May 8	Mar. 9	Mar. 7
North Dakota	June 12	Apr. 13	Apr. 11

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1984 CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY DATES—ALPHABETICAL  
LIST BY STATE—Continued

State	Primary date	60-day cutoff (Postal facility)	62-day cutoff (Folding room)
Ohio	May 8	Mar. 9	Mar. 7
Oklahoma	Aug. 28	June 29	June 27
Oregon	May 15	Mar. 16	Mar. 14
Pennsylvania	Apr. 10	Feb. 10	Feb. 8
Rhode Island	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
South Carolina	June 12	Apr. 13	Apr. 11
South Dakota	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Tennessee	Aug. 2	June 3	June 1
Texas	May 5	Mar. 6	Mar. 4
Utah	Aug. 21	June 22	June 20
Vermont	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Virginia	June 12	Apr. 13	Apr. 11
Washington	Sept. 18	July 20	July 18
West Virginia	June 5	Apr. 6	Apr. 4
Wisconsin	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Wyoming	do	do	Do.
District of Columbia	May 1	Mar. 2	Feb. 29
Guam	Sept. 1	July 3	July 1
Virgin Islands	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
1984 general election	Nov. 6	Sept. 7	Sept. 5

Note: The 60-day and 62-day cutoff regulations also apply to runoff elections in which the Member is a candidate.

THE REMOVAL OF OUR TROOPS  
FROM LEBANON

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, our troops were sent to Lebanon to help keep a fragile peace together while negotiations continued to form a reasonable and lasting settlement. Such a goal may have seemed beyond our reach at the time, but now the situation has clearly changed.

Our troops have not been in a position to act as a peacekeeping force for many months; there has been no peace in Lebanon. After the tragedy of the bombing at the marine barracks, I sent a letter signed by 50 of my colleagues demanding to know exactly what the troops were there to accomplish and how soon they would be withdrawn. We never received an adequate answer to those questions from this administration. Mr. Reagan still insists that our presence in Lebanon is a peaceful and humanitarian one. I am appalled at the deliberate ignorance of fact displayed by this kind of rhetoric.

It is time to bring our troops out of this impossible and hazardous situation. We will gain nothing by losing more marines, and if they stay we are guaranteed to lose more innocent lives. I commend the following article by Mr. Tom Wicker from the New York Times:

## TIME TO CUT LOSSES

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, December 8—President Reagan's folly in pledging American "credibility" on keeping the Marines in Lebanon is now beginning to come clear. So is the Senate's shortsightedness in approving a war powers resolution that permits him to keep U.S. forces in that impossibly fractious land for 18 months.

As personnel losses edge up and U.S. involvement in a Middle Eastern war inevita-

bly creeps ahead, merely moving the marines to a safer base isn't enough. Mr. Reagan has only one sensible option: Get the Marines out of Lebanon as fast as he can, while his and their losses can still be cut. U.S. credibility will be better served by such prudence than by continued wastage of lives and effort in a vain, dangerous cause.

In the first place, the Marines' "mission"—to the extent Mr. Reagan has made it clear—is one of cross-purposes. A U.S. force cannot in fact be a mere "peacekeeping" force if it is also in Lebanon to help President Gemayel consolidate his shaky regime. That dubious goal converts what began as a unit of a peacekeeping force into an armed instrument of U.S. policy, and one that presents a fair target to those who oppose that policy.

Other units of that force—British, French, Italian—also represent NATO nations. But the situation in Lebanon has too many East-West overtones for a peacekeeping force so constituted to be effective. If a peacekeeping force could be helpful, which is doubtful, units from third-world nations and perhaps Sweden and Ireland would be more appropriate.

Aside from the peacekeeping function, however, the political mission of the Marines—helping Mr. Gemayel extend his control over a unified Lebanon—seems all but impossible. So deep are the political and religious divisions of the Lebanese people and so determined is Syria to play a strong role in Lebanon's political development that reconciling the one and driving out the other probably would require a real war—with the Soviet Union lending full support to the Syrians.

Nor are the Marines contributing to the security of Israel, which knows how to take care of itself anyway. Israelis are not now being shielded by the Marines; on the contrary, they would undoubtedly be drawn into an escalating U.S.-Syrian war, the consequences of which can hardly be calculated.

Risking such a war, risking those consequences—almost certainly including a full-scale confrontation with the Soviet Union—offers far greater dangers than anything the Marines and U.S. naval power can conceivably accomplish in Lebanon. And even if the worst consequences could somehow be avoided, there still would be a high price to pay in the valuable lives of honorable young Americans, who deserve better of their country than a futile mission and a lot of brave talk from Washington about credibility and determination.

And if Mr. Reagan is too high-minded to think about domestic political consequences, his aides certainly should; for the longer he insists that the Marines stay in Beirut, taking casualties though accomplishing nothing, the more they will open for him the kind of bleeding political wound that the hostages in Iran did for President Carter in 1980.

Mr. Carter was for a year unable to get the hostages home. If Mr. Reagan seems unable to get the Marines home, and can "protect" them only at the cost of an ever-rising American body count—not to mention the risk of involvement in a Middle Eastern war, or of Soviet intervention—he may pay next year the same kind of political price Mr. Carter did. American voters like to see problems solved, even abandoned, rather than being allowed to drag on endlessly.

The difficulty for Mr. Reagan, of course, is that he does not want to admit defeat in his pursuit of a Gemayel Government

ruling a Lebanon in which Syria has no involvement; and he does not wish to appear to have backed away from a confrontation with Syria's Soviet backers. These are not idle concerns for a world leader.

But the fact is that Mr. Reagan has put the Marines in an untenable position. He has pursued a political goal in Lebanon that he had little chance of achieving. In his televised speech following the bomb blast that killed 240 marines, he gave undue and exaggerated importance to the need for keeping them there. And while the necessity for a showdown with the Russians may someday arise, Lebanon—so bitterly divided, so peripheral to true American interests—presents no such apocalyptic crisis.

Mr. Reagan can say, and most of the world would believe, that the U.S. tried to bring peace and unity to Lebanon, but that this proved to be an impossible task, risking larger war. That would only be the truth, which occasionally has more diplomatic and political power than any face-saving device.●

### THE ULTIMATE MARATHON

#### HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, 1984 will be noted for more than just the Los Angeles Olympics. It will also be the year of the ultimate marathon. Barry Ward, a friend and constituent from my district in New Mexico, is president of Vision Sports, Inc. They are hoping to enlist thousands of runners in a trans-American marathon race. The great foot war will begin on September 3 in Runnemeade, N.J., and end October 22 at Pasadena, Calif.

The great race is a direct descendant of the "Corns and Bunion Derby" that was run in 1928 and 1929. Entries will be limited to 5,000 people with two first place awards for \$150,000.

The technical adviser for the race is University of New Mexico Coach Del Hessel. Del is a leader in the field of track and field and is nationally recognized for this work with the university.

There will be separate divisions in the race for individuals and teams. The city of Albuquerque has entered a team and Mayor Harry Kinney is wagering a bushel of fine green chile if, "in the unlikely event," the team loses.

I urge my colleagues in the House to get behind teams in their districts and make the ultimate marathon the greatest sporting event in America. Of course, along with Mayor Kinney, a friendly wager could be made.●

### A TRIBUTE TO JAMES E. LOGAN

#### HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, James E. Logan will be recognized at the February 3, 1984, Huntington Beach-Fountain Valley Board of Realtors awards program for his outstanding service as 1983 regional vice president for District 32 of California Association of Realtors. As the regional vice president, he was responsible for providing leadership and liaison with six Orange County real estate boards representing more than 6,000 realtors. (These six boards are: Huntington Beach-Fountain Valley, Newport Harbor-Costa Mesa, Irvine, Saddleback, Laguna, and South Orange County.) When you review the brief report of Jim's career in the real estate industry, as well as his outstanding record of service to our local board and to the California Association of Realtors, you will agree that he is deserving of a special commendation.

Jim has been an active member of the Huntington Beach-Fountain Valley Board of Realtors since 1970. During his 13 years of service on this board, he held office as board president, was elected to three terms of office as secretary/treasurer, and served as chairman of the building committee, finance and budget committee and grievance committee. He has twice received the President's Annual Service Award, and in 1977, was named "Realtor Associate of the Year."

Jim has been involved in statewide to C.A.R. for 11 years, and has served as 32d district chairman of the Professional Standards Committee, sergeant at arms, chairman of the bylaws committee, and as a member of the home protection committee, chairman of the membership subcommittee on membership promotions, and regional vice president. He is continuing to play an active role at both the local and State levels.

Prior to entering the real estate profession in 1970, Jim was a captain in the U.S. Marine Corps and was awarded the Navy commendation, the Purple Heart and other decorations.

From 1970 to 1976, while stationed with the Marine Corps unit at Seal Beach, he participated each year in the "Toys for Tots" program. He served as commanding officer from 1974-76 and in 1976 raised 118,000 toys for needy children in Orange County. This record has never been broken.

During 1982-83, he served as president of the University High School Basketball Boosters Club in Irvine. In 1983, he also chaired the promotions committee for the football boosters

club. And of course, as a member of the Huntington Beach-Fountain Valley Board of Realtors, he has participated actively in the board's annual fundraising efforts for the paramedics.

As the representative of the Huntington Beach-Fountain Valley area, I take great pride in joining the board of realtors in commending James E. Logan for his commitment and dedication to the community.●

### REVIVE THE MORTGAGE REVENUE BOND PROGRAM

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I introduced a bill (H.R. 4619) to revive the now defunct single-family mortgage revenue bond program, a major source of low-interest, fixed rate mortgage financing. Under this legislation, the mortgage bond program, which expired on December 31, would be reauthorized for another 5 years.

Tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds have been used by the States and localities to provide below-market financing for some 1 million homebuyers. The reauthorization of this program is vital to the homebuilders and potential homeowners of our Nation, particularly those of low and moderate income.

In 1983, the issuance of mortgage revenue bonds provided some \$11 billion to finance the sale of 220,000 housing units nationwide. In addition to financing nearly 15 percent—90,000 units—of all new single-family home sales in 1983, these bonds generated about 100,000 new construction jobs, producing about \$1.7 billion in wages, and approximately \$800 million in Federal, State, and local taxes.

My home State of New York, through Sonny Mae, issued \$376 million in tax-exempt mortgage bonds in 1983, which was used to finance 6,000 mortgage loans—most of which went to first-time homebuyers. New York State is expected to receive \$1 billion in economic benefits from their 1983 bond issuance, including 2,000 new construction jobs.

Mortgages financed by these tax-exempt bonds are typically 2 to 3 percentage points below conventionally financed mortgages, making the cost of a home much more affordable to low and moderate-income Americans. For example, the median income of homebuyers using mortgage bond financing was \$23,511 in 1982, compared to the \$39,196 median income of conventional-loan homebuyers.

Sonny Mae was providing 9.75 and 9.90 percent fixed rate, 30-year loans



as a result of last year's mortgage bond issuance. If these low-interest, fixed rate mortgage loans were no longer available in 1984, as many as 7,000 New York State residents would be prevented from buying homes.

As Federal housing assistance continues to dwindle, State and local governments are faced with greater responsibility in meeting housing needs. Mortgage bonds have proven highly successful in responding to that challenge and are one of the only home financing tools available at the State and local level. My bill would assure that this success story can continue for at least the next 5 years. I urge that it be given prompt and favorable consideration.●

DON MITCHELL OF ROCKWALL  
COUNTY, TEX.

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. RALPH M. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, my friend Don Mitchell has maintained his home and studio in my home county, Rockwall. This special Rockwall edition of "Texas: Its Lore and Its Lure" is his tribute in word and watercolor to the Rockwall lifestyle to which he gives credit for much of his success as an artist and author.

Rockwall County is the smallest county in Texas. It is even smaller when you measure only that portion not submerged beneath Lake Ray Hubbard. The clay content of the soil is so heavy that trees have difficulty growing to full stature. The best specimens grow in the creek bottoms; so when a creek is dammed to create a private lake, the largest trees wind up under water.

The overall effect may appear somewhat gaunt to the newcomer. To those of us who call it home, Rockwall County has an open, wind-swept charm which grows with the years. My home county cradles an unusual mixture of those of us who were born there—and many many other wonderful families who have moved into the county. Don Mitchell is one of the latter and we are truly blessed to have him as our neighbor.

Most creative people, artists and authors in particular, seem to find inspiration from simple, rustic locations. Without comparing painting styles, it would be correct to say that Rockwall County is to Mitchell what Chadd's Ford, Pa. is to Andrew Wyeth. Every painting in the first chapter of the book, together with the one on page 97, is an actual, not merely typical, Rockwall County setting. Don Mitchell's love for Rockwall and Hubbard's east shore shines through every one of

them. The following is an excerpt from the Rockwall chapter:

It was early November, an exciting season in Rockwall County.

Out of the dense morning fog which mantled my lake in mist and enshrouded my hill in mystery, my geese were talking. About what? To whom? As I stepped out onto the patio, I could hear the other end of the celestial conversation. Out of the mist came unseen voices from above, hurtling through the heavens on instrument, guided by urges which didn't depend upon computer input. Down the Trinity flyway they came as unerringly as they had come in other Novembers for countless generations past. And hopefully as they would come for countless generations into the future.

No other sound in nature can quite match autumn's trumpets of heaven for mystery, romance, blood-tingling excitement and the feeling of sheer joy of just being alive and hearing it. Just why does the primordial chorus of gobbling geese weave such a magic spell in the heart of man? Is it an unconscious yearning in all of us for the freedom of the wilderness? Is it the mystery of far-away places? Is it the assuring, comforting constancy of uniform patterns in nature? Is it simply one more evidence of the power and provision of our Creator?

Show me a man who isn't thrilled to the depths of his being by the sound of migrating geese and I'll show you a man who doesn't react to much else in life either, who on a scale of one-to-ten, lives his life at about five.

By eight a.m. on the same November morning, I was enjoying one of the highlights of the day, a leisurely no-stop-light sun-at-my-back journey from home and studio to gallery and marketplace, from one exciting world to another just as exciting but quite different. Usually, in true Walter Mitty fashion, I enjoy imagining myself at the helm of a cabin cruiser for the three mile trip across water as the I-30 causeway spans Lake Ray Hubbard from Rockwall to Faulkner Point. This morning I chose the back road, FM-740 down the east shore to I-20 below the dam.

The mist had burned away. The air sparkled with the brilliant freshness of morning and a new day as yet unsullied. Out over Lake Ray Hubbard I could gradually detect movement, first gray, then white, first darker than the blue of the morning sky, then lighter. The movement was drifting slowly southward about 500 feet above the water. Gradually as I drew nearer, the undulating cloud materialized into a flock of more than a thousand geese, caught in an agonizing moment of indecision. The lake beckoned. They wanted to land but the experienced leaders in the flock were opposed to the north Texas stopover. The Gulf was still hundreds of miles away.

So they circled around and around, first their breasts, gradually drifting southward as they argued. Suddenly, a second and more purposeful flock, heading straight, down the middle of the lake with no intention of stopping, came speeding through their uncertain formation, spearing it like an arrow. Immediately they recognized new and stronger leadership. The clamor ceased. The two flocks become one. Wing beats developed power and rhythm. The traditional V-formation developed and their journey continued, across the dam, across I-20 and on south until at last they were merely an undulating, wavering hyphen on the horizon.

Once again the open vistas and limitless skies of Rockwall county had worked their charm in the heart of a grateful resident. What a way to start a new day! What thrills could the City of Dallas offer that day which could possibly match those I had just experienced?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this very sensitive and talented man be extended the congratulations of the U.S. Congress—as a great citizen—a gifted artist—and a wonderful friend.●

#### TAX EXEMPT MORTGAGE REVENUE PROGRAM

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, because some 334 of the Members of this body were cosponsors of a measure to extend the tax exempt mortgage revenue program, I think we're probably all aware and distressed about the expiration of that program on December 31, 1983. The termination of this program occurred because the measure was never presented to the Congress as a solitary issue. Obviously, it could easily have passed on the suspensions calendar, but it is instead being held hostage as a sweetener in a tax package which itself was never considered last year due to the rule the measure was assigned.

State housing finance agencies have utilized tax-exempt financing mechanisms and Federal subsidies to lower the cost of housing for low- and moderate-income families for the past 25 years. In the State of Michigan, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority was established in 1966, and began a single family program in 1971. Since that time, approximately 13,213 families have received mortgage assistance. In addition, MSHDA finances construction and/or substantial rehabilitation of rental units for families and seniors. It also issues low-interest home and neighborhood improvement loans, and is involved in administering some of the section 8 rental housing in the State. In 1983, over 1,600 families were assisted, and some 3,573 single family homes were constructed with MSHDA moneys. In Michigan, we are very proud of the job MSHDA is doing, and we want to see its successes continue.

The mortgage revenue bond program is a valuable source of affordable housing for many of this country's first-time home buyers. It has helped stimulate the home construction industry and provided many thousands of jobs. A healthy housing industry is a stimulus to our economy, and as we continue to climb out of the recession, the value of the mortgage revenue

bond program cannot be underestimated.

I urge my colleagues to insist on early action on the extension of the mortgage revenue bond program. Let us not hold it hostage to a tax bill which is susceptible to the politics of an election year. This program is too valuable to subject it to this type of treatment.●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER KEITH B. KENNY

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, with the death on Tuesday December 20, of Father Keith B. Kenny, administrator and pastor of Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish, the Sacramento Diocese and the State of California lost an ardent and exceptional champion of the Hispanic community, the disadvantaged, the poor, and the oppressed. Reverend Kenny supported those who needed support the most and while it would be difficult to express the gratitude of the people he helped, I would like to review some of his many deeds and accomplishments.

Born an Irish Catholic in Nebraska, Reverend Kenny spent virtually all of his 30-year career in Spanish-speaking parishes. He spoke the Spanish language and understood the needs of the Hispanic community.

Reverend Kenny served briefly as assistant pastor in Red Bluff and Colusa, Calif., then in 1955 came to Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish. He began as assistant pastor, advanced to administrator and finally to pastor, serving from 1969 to 1973. During that time he was active in local Catholic youth programs and served as director of Catholic social services.

In 1975, he served as director of social welfare for the California Catholic Conference, and in 1981, he was named director of the Diocesan Office of Research and Planning. He formally sat on the Sacramento Planning Commission, simultaneously serving as president and chairman of the board for the Sacramento Area Economic Opportunity Council. He traveled in South America and was a thoughtful and articulate critic of America's intervention policy in that region.

Always, Reverend Kenny tried to stop the injustices he saw in this world. He fought the cause of the migrant farmworkers and marched against discrimination. He spoke for the poor when other voices were silent.

For those who know him, our prayers and thoughts go out to his sister, Margaret Mary, his brother, Tom, and his aunt, Mary Reynolds.

But as a Bishop who knew him well said:

Because he was a prayerful and compassionate man, he will be no stranger to God, nor God a stranger to him.●

FELICIA'S FELICITY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasanter aspects of breakfast on Sundays in Massachusetts is the chance to read the weekly topical poem written by Felicia Lamport. Her poetry shows that humor and insight go very well together, and her ability to weave both of these qualities into intricate and delightful rhyming patterns is one of our State's great literary resources.

On December 11, Felicia Lamport turned her attention to the situation in Central America with her usual intellectual and verbal felicity, a word which ought to mean the ability to write like Felicia. I ask that her poem be reprinted here, because it is a brilliant comment on our Central American policy, as well as very reading.

CENTER DENTER

(By Felicia Lamport)

"We've tried dozens of devices to defuse our backyard crisis."

Reagan stated, "but it's getting out of hand."

Guatemala and Honduras prove unable to secure us

From the Marxist Sandinista burning brand.

Though we struggle to upgrade them and covertly C.I.A. aid them,

Our Contras are a no-good, worthless band.

Yet the Salvador guerrillas are encroaching on the villas

Of the pillars of our allies' High Command.

"But the Nicaraguan devil doesn't play it on the level

He's made hay of my Grenada derring-do. And is starting to make more hay with his propagandist, Borge,

Spouting peace talk that is patently untrue.

Though we muffled this appeaser by denying him a visa,

Still he manages to get his message through."

Staffers sighed in desperation, but a sudden inspiration

From their leader raised their spirits in a bound,

"Boys, I've just thought up a practical and innovative tactic

That is sure to get this tangled skein unwound.

We will take our Contra morons and the rebel Salvadorans

And just switch the two guerrilla bands around;

Then we'll have those Sandinistas sprawling flat-out on their keisters!"

Came a cheer that made the Oval Room resound.●

LEE HAMILTON: CONSCIENTIOUS LEADERSHIP FOR A RESPONSIBLE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, a great many of us in the Congress, struggling with the tough foreign policy agenda before us, are exceedingly thankful for the leadership and insight that Representative LEE HAMILTON has given to us on these issues. Yesterday, the Wall Street Journal carried a profile of Representative HAMILTON entitled, "Hamilton Questions Reagan Policies."

I would urge my colleagues to read the article, and I would say to my colleague from Indiana that it expresses the sentiments of many of us who look to him for guidance and highly value his opinions.

HAMILTON QUESTIONS REAGAN POLICIES—INDIANA CONGRESSMAN PLAYS GROWING ROLE IN U.S. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By David Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—He is a quiet man who can make himself heard, a minister's son who sits at the right hand of power. Almost unnoticed, Lee Hamilton has come of age in Congress, and after two decades in the House, the cautious Democrat from southern Indiana is assuming a prominent role in shaping foreign policy.

"He has great credibility with me," says House Speaker Thomas O'Neill.

As Congress begins debate on the two divisive issues that will dominate this session—Central America and the continued presence of U.S. Marines in Lebanon—Mr. Hamilton is perhaps the most important single adviser to the House Democratic leadership.

"There are accents to the speaker's voice," says Majority Whip Thomas Foley (D-Wash.) describing Mr. O'Neill's tone at leadership meetings. "He will say, 'Lee, what have you got to say on this?'"

Rep. Hamilton is taken seriously at the White House, too. Just last week President Reagan answered Mr. Hamilton's queries about the Marines' presence in Lebanon with a lengthy reply that amounted to a major policy statement on the administration's determination to keep them there.

Last summer he got the White House's attention on Central American policy when he helped lead an unprecedented challenge to the administration's covert war in Nicaragua. And now he is expressing reservations about the Kissinger Commission report on Central America, which the Reagan administration intends to use to bolster its plea for more military aid to its allies in that region.

"The biggest disappointment is the lack of emphasis on negotiations," he says of the Kissinger Commission report. "There's not enough emphasis on political solutions."

With the death of Chairman Clement Zablocki (D., Wis.) last year, Mr. Hamilton is the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and in combination with the feisty new chairman, Rep. Dante Fascell (D., Fla.) his rise is seen by Democrats as an



opportunity for the House panel to reassert itself in foreign policy.

His three years on the Intelligence Committee have added to his stature and aggressiveness so that the Indiana Democrat is a critical barometer of the White House's ability to win bipartisan support for its foreign policy initiatives.

At 52 years old, Mr. Hamilton is part of a new generation of leaders who fall between the post-World War II and post-Vietnam eras. He is less apt to apply either of those historic analogies to foreign policy. Instead, he draws lessons from both. He often seemed a bridge between Mr. Zablocki and younger Democrats because he shares not only the late chairman's commitment to an American role abroad but also the younger generation's suspicion of military entanglements.

His rural district in southern Indiana gives him unusual freedom from the ethnic voting blocks that often influence Congress on foreign policy, and this has added to his credibility. Under President Carter, he took the lead in a difficult fight for military aid to Turkey opposed by Greek-Americans, including his powerful Indiana colleague, former Majority Whip John Brademas. In 1980, Mr. Hamilton made a less successful effort to salvage \$3.5 million in economic funds for Syria, opposed by Jewish voters and members aligned with the pro-Israel lobby.

He prefers diplomacy to military solutions. For instance, he is far more willing to approve economic aid to Central America than a substantial increase in arms assistance. He insists on human-rights conditions on arms for El Salvador, and last year he played a critical role in preserving Democratic unity on that issue.

While Mr. Reagan may dismiss liberal opposition in Congress, to lose Mr. Hamilton is to lose a crucial bridge between the left and right.

This was most evident in the debate on Nicaragua last summer, and in both Intelligence and Foreign Affairs committees, the CIA-backed incursion provoked a sharp partisan split. Though Mr. Zablocki wavered, Mr. Hamilton was firmly allied with Intelligence Committee Chairman Edward Boland (D., Mass.), and their victory laid the groundwork for a later compromise limiting funding for the operation.

In a rare secret session of the full House, it was Mr. Hamilton who delivered what many described as the most damaging speech. The Congressman built his case by turning the CIA's recently completed National Intelligence Estimate against the CIA and administration. "The two most careful guys in the House are probably Eddie Boland and Lee Hamilton," said Rep. Leon Panetta (D., Calif.) after the closed door session. "If they're concerned about a policy, you'd better be concerned."

Even as Mr. Hamilton helped draft the Lebanon war powers resolution last fall allowing the Marines to stay in Beirut for 18 months, he warned the administration it couldn't expect continued support from the House for the full period. Unless diplomatic progress is made, he said, his backing of the Marine presence could wane after March, and he was clearly disappointed that Mr. Reagan gave no encouragement of an earlier withdrawal in his letter to Mr. Hamilton last week.

This exchange between the president and Mr. Hamilton is a striking illustration of the Democrat's importance and style. Always cautious, the congressman didn't consider

even writing a letter until encouraged by Rep. Les Aspin (D., Wis.), who has a greater flair for publicity and political maneuvering. The first and final drafts were Mr. Hamilton's in substance, however.

A tall scholarly man who neither drinks nor smokes, Mr. Hamilton is a striking contrast to the burly, cigar smoking Mr. O'Neill. His graying crewcut and flat-toned voice suit his Midwest reserve, but underneath is the more physical, engaging style of the six-foot-four-inch center who starred in basketball in high school and at DePauw University.

Evansville, the congressman's boyhood home, is a river port city on the Ohio. After years of campaigning and post office tours in small hamlets, Mr. Hamilton's picture can be found on the walls of rural gas stations, and the district has put its own stamp on him.

Careful not to move too far away from domestic concerns, he has balanced his foreign policy interest with a long tenure on the Joint Economic Committee, which he will head in 1985. He has separated himself from the Great Society and New Deal liberalism of Lyndon Johnson and Mr. O'Neill, and he almost painfully cultivates the image of the independent who cannot be captured by any interest.

He shrinks from the suggestion that he might have had a mentor or patron in his first years in Congress. As if embarrassed by idealism, he takes refuge in the "pragmatist" label. "It is a liberalism that is almost uniquely Midwestern," says former Rep. Abner Mikva (D., Ill.) of his friend's politics. "It is reform liberalism, not ideological."

A key figure in the early years of the House Ethics Committee, Mr. Hamilton has a lawyer's passion for process, and running back through the Vietnam War, the Congressional Record is laced with his correspondence questioning the State Department on foreign policy. "I think every administration has a tendency not to articulate foreign policy," he said. "They don't like to answer questions on the record and one of the obligations of a member of Congress is to make them do it." ●

#### CONGRESSIONAL ARTS CAUCUS HONORS PEARL BAILEY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congressional Arts Caucus was proud to honor the great entertainer Pearl Bailey. Ms. Bailey has starred as a singer, actress, and author. She has been a recording artist, nightclub headliner, film actress, television performer, and winner of Broadway's Tony Award for her starring role in "Hello Dolly."

A Special Advisor to the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, she has served her Government by furthering human understanding and international relations. Her accomplishments have earned her numerous honorary degrees including a doctorate in music from Howard University and a Doctor of Law degree from Seton Hall University.

Throughout all her activities shines her exceptional musical talents and her great concern that others be given the opportunity for a complete education. Her early ambition to be a schoolteacher, her continued advocacy for educational issues, and her recent entry as a student at Georgetown University are evidence of her life-long involvement with education.

The Congressional Arts Caucus was pleased to honor Pearl Bailey for her outstanding achievements in music and education at a special reception, where the Caucus also announced the introduction of a joint resolution recognizing the important contribution the arts make to education.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this resolution and urge all my colleagues to join as cosponsors:

H.J. RES.—

Recognizing the important contributions of the arts to a complete education

Whereas historically the arts have provided societies with a truly human means of expression that goes well beyond ordinary language;

Whereas the arts serve as a powerful expression of thoughts and feelings, as a means to challenge and extend the human experience, and as a distinctive way of understanding human beings and nature;

Whereas few areas of life are as important to a free, democratic society as education;

Whereas a country in which pluralism and individual expression are an essential part of its character must rely on a high level of shared education to foster a common culture;

Whereas public discussion following recent studies of education in America indicates an increasing desire to strengthen our Nation's schools;

Whereas the arts provide an important aspect of a complete education and have been included as one of the six basic academic subjects by the College Board;

Whereas practice and preparation in the arts can develop discipline, concentration, and self-confidence;

Whereas participation in the arts helps to develop the higher levels of skill, literacy, and training essential to enable individuals to participate fully in our national life;

Whereas exposure to the arts is an integral part of the understanding and appreciation of the diverse cultures of the world;

Whereas the arts serve to preserve our uniquely American culture and provide a particularly effective means to present it to other nations; and

Whereas the arts enrich our lives by offering fulfillment through self-expression and aesthetic appreciation: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That we recognize the important contribution of the arts to a complete education and urge all citizens to support efforts which strengthen artistic training and appreciation within our Nation's schools.* ●

# STATES SHOULD RAISE THE DRINKING AGE TO 21

## HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, after 18 months of exhaustive study, the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving has issued its final report—the product of 100 hours of hearings across the country at which medical experts, law enforcement officials, safety authorities, and victims of drunk driving accidents testified about the tragedy of drunk driving.

One of the Commission's key recommendations: States should immediately adopt 21 years as the minimum legal purchasing and public possession age for all alcoholic beverages.

In the last two Congresses, I have sponsored a concurrent resolution advocating just this point. House Concurrent Resolution 23, which currently has 83 cosponsors, simply expresses the sense of the Congress that all States and the District of Columbia should raise the minimum legal age for drinking and purchasing all alcoholic beverages to 21.

House Concurrent Resolution 23 is endorsed by the Departments of Transportation and Health and Human Services, the Office of Management and Budget, the National Transportation Safety Board and the National Safety Council. It is supported by Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), the American Medical Association (AMA), the American Automobile Association (AAA), the International Chiefs of Police, and numerous health and insurance organizations.

This approach does not: establish a Federal drinking law, deny highway funds to States which do not comply, or provide incentive grants to States which adopt 21. It encourages this debate to take place in individual State legislative chambers, since traditionally the States have had jurisdiction in the regulation of the sale and distribution of alcohol.

Once again, I am asking for the support of my colleagues in the House in what I consider to be the first step Congress should take in establishing 21 as the nationwide legal age for drinking.

Thank you.●

# TRIBUTE TO MR. TOM MCCARTHY

## HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to Mr. Tom

McCarthy who recently attended the World Cup Gymnastic Competition as a coach of the U.S. national team.

Mr. McCarthy is the head coach of the Berks Gymnastic Academy in Wyomissing, Pa. He has coached State, national and international champions including Michelle Goodwin, Gina Stallone, and Cheryl Weatherstone, the national champion of Great Britain. He has also coached the Pennsylvania team in interstate competition and coached in Tokyo, Japan, representing the United States.

The Berks Gymnastic Academy has ranked in the top four teams for several years and currently is ranked third in the Nation. Much of this success is due to the talents of Tom McCarthy.

I know that my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to Mr. McCarthy. He has contributed tirelessly to his profession, his community, his State and his Nation. His special talents have greatly enhanced American gymnastics and he is clearly deserving of national and international recognition. I want to wish him continued success in the future.●

# BANKERS MUST HELP IN ALLEVIATING THE DEBT BURDEN

## HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, many in this country refuse to focus their attention to a dangerous and growing problem. While this country awakens from a profound economic slumber, developing nations continue to struggle against high fuel prices, spiraling inflation, depressed export markets, and unemployment. Investment projects are heaping ruins of unfinished construction, food stores are being looted and the small middle class is quickly disappearing. Meanwhile, conversion from military dictatorship to a true democracy will be forced to pay over 10 percent of GNP in debt repayments this year.

American commercial banks have refused to accept a share of the burden of a longstanding problem which is partly of their making. Banks are insisting on extremely high rates of interest, which although quite profitable, create enormous pressures on Latin American governments. A Washington Post editorial of last month points out that Brazil is forced to pay about 14.5 percent interest on its rescheduled loans. Our inflation rate is now 3.4 percent yearly, making the real (nominal interest rate minus inflation) interest rate charged by banks to Brazil about 10.7 percent. This is far above a traditionally good rate of return.

The editorial points out that when a domestic company gets into trouble,

bankers usually lower interest rates to help the company through the squeeze. That might squeeze immediate profits somewhat, but it makes good economic sense. Why, then, do not the banks apply the same rationale to their beleaguered customers abroad? It would serve their own long-term interests, as well as those of this country and all other countries hoping to grow and prosper in a healthy international economic environment. May I, Mr. Speaker, commend this article to my esteemed colleagues?

The article follows:

## AMERICAN BANKS, LATIN DEBTS

In their lending to Latin America, the American commercial banks have not demonstrated any great degree of either caution or foresight. First they lent far more than they intended. Now they are insisting on extremely high interest rates on those loans.

The present level of interest is highly profitable for the banks as long as it is paid. But it is creating gigantic pressures in Latin America for moratoriums and unilateral action by Latin governments—action that would disrupt not only the world economy in general but the stability of the international banking system itself.

The crucial case is Brazil, which currently owes more than \$90 billion. Of that, about \$63 billion is financed at floating rates. Those rates are generally two percentage points above either the London interbank rate, now about 10.5 percent a year, or the New York prime rate, which is 11 percent. That brings the average close to 13 percent a year.

That's a swinging rate for debt that is denominated in U.S. dollars, in which inflation is now running about 5 percent a year. It means that the real interest rate—the nominal rate minus inflation—is in the vicinity of 8 percent. That's four times the traditional return on this kind of loan. In addition, the banks have been charging a point and a half in fees on each rescheduling. On the substantial part of the Brazilian debt that has been rescheduled this year, that brings interest currently to about 14.5 percent. The Brazilians have fallen behind in payments. Is that surprising?

One expert witness, Arthur Burns, the former chairman of the Federal Reserve and now American ambassador to Germany, touched on the subject recently in talking with reporters at the American Enterprise Institute. Mr. Burns observed that the banks are not treating foreign governments as they do domestic borrowers. When a domestic company gets into trouble, its bankers usually lower rates to see it through the squeeze. They reason that it makes good economic sense to sacrifice some interest in order to save a customer. Mr. Burns wondered why the banks don't apply the same logic to their customers abroad.

Some of the big banks argue that they have to keep rates high so the smaller banks will continue to participate in the loans. That's open to question. Some American bankers also note that many of the loans to Latin America come from European and Japanese banks. That's true, but irrelevant. Any leadership is going to have to come from the Americans.

Lower rates mean lower risks. Instead, the bankers seem to be pressing blindly in the opposite direction. Perhaps statesmanship is too much to ask. But the great American



banks have come to a point at which they would serve themselves, as well as their customers, by considering more carefully where their own real self-interest lies.●

#### STATEMENT ON THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL DAY

#### HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to join the Ukrainian people in commemoration of the 66th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. The continued struggle for independence with courage and tenacity of these people reminds us once again that human dignity and freedom are most precious and that, to regain them, ultimate sacrifices are being made by the oppressed people of the Ukraine today.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people proclaimed their national independence in defiance of the will of their mighty neighbor to the north, the Soviets. After a 3-year-long and heroic struggle, the Ukrainians were overpowered by the Russians and their republic was incorporated into the Soviet Socialist Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of the Ukrainian people has not been crushed at the hands of the Soviet soldiers, their love for and determination to regain and preserve their right to self-determination, their distinct history, language and culture has not been dimmed by the Russian domination, and their optimism for the ultimate independence has not been diminished. Each year goes by with an ever higher hope and an increasingly more strengthened conviction to live their lives free of external interference and control.

Through their dedication and struggle, the Ukrainian people have inspired peoples around the world in their own strive to preserve and protect their treasured independence, human dignity and national sovereignty. The Ukrainian people deserve our encouragement and support in the hope that the day come sooner when their own national independence will be restored.●

#### GRENADA

#### HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago when the President authorized a military intervention on the island of Grenada, he did so to preserve freedom and to save not only the

Americans residing on the island, but also the citizens of Grenada from the oppression of an undemocratic government that was supported by Cuba and the Soviet Union.

At a time when our President is being criticized by his political opponents, it is encouraging to know that the citizens of the United States stand behind him and support his decision to remain firm in defending America and the freedoms we so cherish.

A citizen of the 17th District of Pennsylvania recently wrote to President Reagan expressing not only his support for this move but also support for the presence of our troops in Lebanon. This letter, by Samuel Sherron, reminds the President and his critics that the price of freedom is never too high. I would like to submit this letter to the RECORD for the review of my colleagues.

HARRISBURG, PA.,  
October 30, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,  
President of the United States, White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I do not know whether or not this letter will reach your desk, but in case it does, I would like to express my feelings and the feelings of many Americans who live in central Pennsylvania with whom I have spoken and who have expressed their opinions to me about the military action you have ordered in both Grenada and Lebanon.

Mr. President, you have our support to the fullest, and we agree that freedom is something that must constantly be fought for and cannot be taken for granted.

I personally immigrated to the United States exactly 35 years ago to this date, and I have been exposed to Communist terror at the age of 8 in my native Lithuania, when the Soviets occupied our town in 1940. A year later, when the war broke out and the Germans occupied Lithuania, I was taken by the Nazi dictatorship and survived the Holocaust (Auschwitz, Warsaw and Dachau). My mother, my sisters and 72 members of my family were shot by the Nazis. Therefore, I feel I am perhaps a little more qualified to render an opinion about your military decisions than most. There is absolutely no gift greater than that of freedom, and people who had always had it are not as apt to realize its value. We do not want to lose our dearly cherished liberty, because I know what it means to live under dictatorship. Those few politicians who do not agree with your decisions have never, thank God, lived under a dictatorship and have no perception of what is at stake.

Anything you do, Mr. President, in order to preserve that freedom and insure that communism will not come to our shores is not too big a price to pay.

May God give you the health and strength to continue to lead us for the next five years with the same policies as you have followed in the past, and then our country will survive and continue to lead the world in the kind of freedom that allows a plain citizen like myself to sit down and write a letter to his President.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL SHERRON.●

JUSTICE, 1984

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that President Reagan intends to appoint Edwin Meese as Attorney General indicates that the President intends to continue the tradition he began by naming James Watt Secretary of the Interior and Anne Gorsuch Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Meese has been identified throughout his tenure in Washington with opposition to Federal efforts on behalf of the constitutional rights of Americans in and out of Government. Moving him from the inner workings of the White House to the Department that is supposed to be able to provide some objective view of Government legal controversies compounds the error of this administration's policies in the fields which come under the jurisdiction of the Justice Department.

A recent editorial in the Boston Globe makes the case against this unfortunate degradation of the Justice Department quite forcefully and I ask that it be printed here. Those who have to look to the U.S. Justice Department for vindication of their constitutional rights will gain no comfort from the appointment of Mr. Meese.

The editorial follows:

JUSTICE, 1984

For proponents of civil rights and civil liberties there is no solace in the news that Attorney General William French Smith is resigning and that President Reagan is nominating his friend and White House counsel or Edwin Meese for the post.

While Smith gets some points for strengthening the federal attack on drug traffic and for keeping hands off the work of US district attorneys, he has been anything but a forceful presence in the job.

That is not to say that during his tenure the Justice Department has been invisible. On the contrary, the last three years has seen a virtual about-face in the department's commitment to civil rights enforcement, a substantial weakening of antitrust activity and a woeful willingness to encourage the invasion of the private lives of individual citizens and to restrict the free-speech rights of thousands of government workers.

The appointment of Meese means that those efforts will only be redoubled. Smith, a socialite and corporate lawyer, seemed somewhat out of his element in government; Meese by contrast is a veteran inside player and will push his ideas with considerably more force than Smith ever could muster.

Meese has been the driving force in the Reagan Administration efforts to reverse the philosophical views of the US Civil Rights Commission on busing and affirmative action; he has been a leader in the efforts to cripple the Legal Services program; he is a strong critic of "judicial activism."

More broadly the Meese nomination continues a bad tradition—a tradition that with the notable exception of President Ford's appointment of Edward Levi goes back at least to the appointment of Robert Kennedy—of the selection of close presidential associates as attorney general. This practice tends to undermine the standing of the Attorney General as a special-quasi-independent post in the federal government.

While Meese's confirmation by the Republican-controlled Senate is all but assured, liberals and moderates on the Senate Judiciary Committee should use his confirmation hearings to display before the country the peculiar Meese-Reagan view of what justice means to them in 1984.●

## NATIONAL NURSING HOME RESIDENTS DAY

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Aging since its inception and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care, I have worked side by side with my colleagues to improve the health and well-being of all older Americans. Older Americans are the foundation of our great country. Our elderly people have done more for this country than anybody else because they have been here longer. They have fought its wars, tilled its soil, reared its families, and upheld its ideals. They have played, and continue to play, a vital role in our society, and it is important to develop a greater public awareness of their many contributions.

In calling for National Nursing Home Residents Day, I would like to honor the more than 1 million Americans who reside in nursing homes. These American citizens are often outside the mainstream of society, isolated from their friends and relatives. Mr. Speaker, in order to commemorate these individuals, I am today introducing a joint resolution designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day."

I believe that the Congress of the United States wants to tell nursing home residents around the country that we do care about them and acknowledge the work they have done to build this country.

With this thought in mind, I offer this resolution at this point in the RECORD.

H.J. Res. 457

Joint resolution designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day"

Whereas over one million older Americans reside in nursing homes and one in five older Americans likely will reside in a nursing home at some time;

Whereas nursing home residents have contributed to the growth, development, and progress of this Nation and, as elders, offer a wealth of knowledge and experience;

Whereas Congress recognizes the importance of the continued participation of these institutionalized senior citizens in the life of our Nation;

Whereas in an effort to foster reintegration of these citizens into their communities Congress encourages community recognition of and involvement in the lives of nursing home residents;

Whereas the Congress recognizes the importance of safeguarding the rights of nursing home residents; and

Whereas it is appropriate for the American people to join in support of nursing home residents to demonstrate their concern and respect for these citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 27, 1984, is designated as "National Nursing Home Residents Day", a time of renewed recognition, concern, and respect for the Nation's nursing home residents. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

## ARNIE WEINMEISTER: THE GENTLEMAN IS A TEAMSTER

### HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, four fine "Washington" connected football players were recently elected into the Pro Football Hall of Fame. My congratulations go to Charley Taylor and Willie Brown, both formerly of the Washington Redskins. I also would like to extend my congratulations to Mike McCormack, who is currently president and general manager of the Seattle Seahawks, for his election into the Hall of Fame. Mike McCormack's leadership was a valuable part of the Seattle Seahawk's successful season.

The last Washington player elected to the Hall of Fame was my friend, Arnie Weinmeister. Arnie is currently president of Teamsters Council 28 and vice president of the Teamsters International Union. Arnie has been a strong advocate for the working people of the Northwest and the country. He was a five-time all-pro lineman in professional football. As a player, he played hard on the field and sought just treatment for he and his fellow players off the field.

I insert into the RECORD a profile of Arnie written in the Seattle Times by Don Duncan and to again congratulate Arnie, Mike McCormack, Charley Taylor, and Willie Brown on their accomplishments.

## ARNIE WEINMEISTER: THE GENTLEMAN IS A TEAMSTER

(By Don Duncan)

"Because of my size, which had been fine in pro football, I was tabbed as a union goon . . . When you are as big as I am, there is always somebody who wants to challenge

you, simply because of who you are. I've been able to avoid most of it."

They are among thousands of nameless neighbors whom we may not know, yet whom we might be rich for having known.

Of many careers, retired or still active, single or dedicated to their families, they are the people who have tried to live their lives well—following dreams, making choices, turning the accidents of fate into foundations rather than stumbling blocks.

This is another in a series of portrayals of "Extraordinary Lives," in which such people speak in their own words of dreams, choice and chance, as recorded and re-created from interviews by Don Duncan.

Arnie Weinmeister, 58, five-time All-Pro football tackle and now Seattle's top Teamsters official, is a study in contrasts.

The enormous hands, 6-4 height and bear-like torso are at odds with the catlike grace, feather-light footstep and gentle voice.

Halfway expecting "deze and doze," the listener finds, instead, literacy and obvious intelligence. Rather than being the ultimate Macho Man, he comes across as sensitive and understanding.

Other union leaders may fret about obtaining ever-better contracts. He wonders out loud if some unions haven't negotiated so well that employers can't meet the conditions imposed upon them.

By everything that is right and honest in sports, his record entitles him to be in the National Football League's Hall of Fame. Second-teamers have been inducted and he has been ignored.

Maybe it's because Weinmeister is the only NFL player ever to break a contract, legally, in court. And that, for a man who lives by the contract, may be the ultimate contradiction.

Back when I was playing, I was supposed to be the highest-paid lineman in the National Football League. My best year, I got \$12,000.

Now you might say, gee, compared to today, that's pretty puny. But think back to 1950. You multiply it by inflation factors and you're really talking about what the average pro-football lineman plays for today. It wasn't all that bad, even though the extras and endorsements available today were practically nonexistent then.

Not many people remember that I started out at the University of Washington as an end one season, as a fullback the next and as a tackle my last year.

That year, as a fullback, they had high hopes for me. I ran pretty good in the first game, against St. Mary's. In the very next game, against UCLA, I got my knee injured on a blind-side block in the third quarter. At the time, they didn't have knee operations perfected as they do today. It took me about a year to recover. Because cutting on the knee was too much of a strain, they moved me to tackle. It must have been a good move, because I was picked for the East-West game.

You heard about pro football very remotely when I was a kid, but I didn't even think about it until 1946, after the war. I'd been in the field artillery in Europe, chief of a gun section on a "Long Tom." We were headed back, scheduled for more action in the Pacific, when the war ended. On VJ Day, we were about a day-and-a-half out of New York.

Anyway, pro football was breaking into the news when I returned to the university. I'd changed, too. Before the war, I'd been willing to just get by in the classroom. When I got back, I really buckled down. I



majoring in economics and minored in math, and I took lots of speech and labor courses. I got a degree.

I was drafted by the New York Yankees in the old All-America Conference—a team owned by Dan Topping and Del Webb, with Ray Flaherty as coach. I played with the Yankees in '48 and '49. When the All-America Conference merged with the National Football League in 1950, one of the concessions to allow the Yankees to play in Yankee Stadium was that the New York Giants were to get their pick of the top six players off the Yankee roster.

Tom Landry (now coach of the Dallas Cowboys) and I were two of them. I played '50 through '53 with the Giants. Frank Gifford wasn't there at the beginning; he came in '52. Charlie Conerly was our quarterback.

I'd been All-Pro for five years—two in the All-America and three times in the NFL—and at the end of the 1962 season I was negotiating a contract for 1963.

I'd been getting a \$1,000-a-year increase for making All-Pro every year. I started with the Giants at \$10,000, moved up to \$11,000 and then to \$12,000. It turned out they would agree to only \$12,000 for the next year, which was in violation of letters that the Giants' owner Wellington Mara had sent me confirming the arrangement.

I thought, "OK, I'll play for \$12,000 and that will be my last year." That's how I got involved in this big case in Seattle. My lawyer was Charlie Horowitz, who later went to the State Supreme Court, and Lloyd Shoretz was the judge. It all hinged on the written agreement, and the court decided the Giants had waived any right to my services for the following year.

So, I went to the Canadian Football League, where the B.C. Lions signed me to a two-year contract for \$15,000 each year. The proximity to Seattle was very nice, because I'd been maintaining two residences when I played in New York, and that was very costly. You didn't wind up being able to save much. I think the first year in pro football netted me a car—a Pontiac sedan, deluxe model, one of those big, heavy brutes.

They always listed me at 235 pounds, although I was really more like 250—up or down 10 pounds. But those clippings showed me at just 235, which is what I weight (laugh) when I first showed up at the University of Washington.

I stayed up in Canada for just two years, and I had some injuries. Because I had started later than some because of the war, and was already 33, I had to decide what to do next. Should I go into business for myself or accept an offer that I had received from the Teamsters? I picked the union, but I honestly don't think I expected to stay with it very long.

They assigned me to the San Francisco Bay area, to organize nonunion plants.

Being a former football player was quite an experience for me. Almost everyone loves football. But when you walk into a plant and announce you are there to organize the employees, you scare everybody to death—the boss and the people working there. You find yourself a controversial figure.

The other thing, and it can't be ignored, is that because of my size, which had been fine in pro football, I was tabbed as a union goon. It's a tag that persists through today. You develop an armadillo hide in this business. If those things bothered you, you'd be really troubled.

When you are as big as I am, there is always somebody who wants to challenge you, simply because of who you are. I've

been able to avoid most of it. I worked for a while for Rainiers Brewery as a beer salesman, and I couldn't go into one of those beer joints without somebody finding out who I was, wanting to challenge me physically.

Most of the time they were somewhat under the influence, and I always figured I'd be wrong no matter what I did. I certainly had nothing to win or to prove. I got rid of most of my aggressions through all the years of football. On the field, I was a very aggressive player. That's where it stayed.

*Weinmeister obviously is pleased to be a part of the labor movement, and he talks about it with enthusiasm.*

It's one of the few jobs that I'm aware of that you feel that almost every day you are doing some good for people who are unable to do themselves any good. You do it even by accident, and you feel a sense of accomplishment.

People who work for a living are unable to represent themselves. You start there. College professors aren't able to represent themselves, unless they are organized. Policemen aren't either. It has taken some people a long time to realize that the only reason they earn less than one of our drivers is that they lack organization and representation.

They may be better educated. They may appear to be better qualified to represent themselves. But, in this society of ours, unless you are a part of a group to be represented, the individual gets lost.

Human beings are pretty much the same. I've always said that if I were in business, I'd pay the people who worked for me enough to keep them productive and happy enough to stay. But I wouldn't be paying them any more than that unless there was somebody telling me that I had to pay them more. In which case, I'd have to cough it up.

That's really the whole nature of the bargaining game. Nobody wants to pay money out of his profits voluntarily to spread it around. That's not human nature. Oh, I suppose there are some exceptions, but very few.

There was an article in Business Week, a year or so ago, that said we had done our job too well. Perhaps we have. We have negotiated such outstanding contracts and fringe benefits that we don't have as many people working under them anymore. The companies are going outside, nonunion, using any deception they can to avoid paying those contracts.

Our master freight agreement is one. We had to open it prematurely this year in an attempt to just hold the line. Essentially what we have done is to have a contract that is negotiated so well that very few trucking companies can stand it and stay in business. That's a difficult posture to be in.

That's pretty much what the UAW (United Auto Workers) did, too. They have conditions and 26 personal holidays leave, and that's 26 days of no work being performed. How can you possibly compete with foreign competition and produce cars when you're paying your people not to work?

There's a happy medium in there somewhere. Where, before, we were always looking for advancement to keep up with inflation, it's now a worldwide industrial conglomerate, a world market—not a U.S. market. It's productivity that counts now.

One of my assignments was community relations when I worked for the Western Conference (of Teamsters) in the San Francisco area. I'd speak at service clubs, schools and universities, discussing the Teamsters organization.

Most of the people in the audience were pretty receptive. I'd say, though, that those Kiwanians and Rotarians in the small communities had never seen or heard a union organizer before. They only knew what they had conjured in their minds. I tried to give straightforward answers.

After doing some organizing in Southern Oregon, I came to Seattle as a business representative for Local 117 (Driver Salesmen & Warehousemen), which was headed by my brother, Bill Williams, who had just been named as a general organizer at the international level. So I went to work for 117, and Bill went to the international.

*Weinmeister's rise, if not meteoric, certainly was swift. He ran for, and was elected to, his first major union office as secretary-treasurer of Local 117 in the early '60s. He's been re-elected ever since. He was elected recording secretary of the executive board of the statewide Joint Council No. 28 in 1966, and was appointed president to replace the late Don Ellis in 1969. He's been re-elected ever since. He was named to fill a vice president's vacancy on the international board in 1973. And, again, he's been re-elected ever since.*

*In earlier times, the No. 1 Teamster here was much more visible than Weinmeister seems to be now. Dave Beck, for example, started in Seattle and became the controversial international president. Weinmeister seems happy that the cult of personalities is past.*

In the days of Beck, the manner in which the structure was established, he was able to be more of a policy determining chairman. In other words, if he set policy, that was it.

Each local union today has its own autonomy and really runs its own affairs. I don't really have the authority to say they must follow a certain policy, other than they are supposed to abide by the national constitution. As long as they are within that framework, that's all that's really required.

Rather than dictating policy, my job is to establish policy through persuasion, salesmanship and trying to get them all heading in the same direction. It is quite a difficult task. Each local is headed by quite a strong individual. They have their own thoughts about the way things should be done.

So, I don't have any of the power or authority that existed in Beck's time. As for being a personality that's out front, sounding off on every issue, I'm not that either. I don't think that every issue that hits the newspapers obligates me to jump in the middle and express the feelings of our organization, one way or another.

Most individuals who do this, and there are some I won't bother to name, certainly have not had the opportunity to discuss things with their own colleagues to find out what their interests really are.

The primary function of our organization is to negotiate contracts on behalf of our members, to keep the membership happy. That's basic and fundamental. When you lose sight of that, people begin to wonder if you're a union representative or some kind of a politician.

*Weinmeister doesn't consider himself any more of an expert at reading contracts than at interpreting the Teamsters' constitution. When there's a contract grievance or some question about the constitution, he goes to the language that's down on paper, reads it and tries to make an honest appraisal. He harbors a suspicion that his appraisal of an NFL contract he thought was being abused has been instrumental in keeping him out of pro football's Hall of Fame.*

There's no question I would like to be in the Hall of Fame. I personally feel that those who controlled the NFL at the time I was playing—and certainly the Giants were one of those controlling teams, an old established ownership—had a lot of say about league policy.

I think that as a result of my having defeated the Giants and the National Football League, when they tried to prevent me from going to Canada, I was simply left in limbo.

Now, we'll have to see whether time has taken care of it. There are an increasing number of articles by sportswriters, and comments from coaches, and the fact that I was on the All-Opponent teams selected by so many of the big-name players of my era. That might change things.

Certainly a number of players are in the Hall of Fame who were second-team All-Pro at the same position for which I was selected on the first team. Leo Nomellini is an example. He was always selected behind me. He's in the Hall of Fame.

Such Hall of Famers as Chuck Bednarik, Dante Lavelli and Mac Speedie picked me on their All-Opponent teams. Tom Landry recently said I should be in the Hall of Fame.

The truth is, I'd long since forgotten about it, until a fellow on Sporting News began writing about what a shame it was and others began talking about it. If it's to be, fine. If it isn't, so be it. It's not going to alter me one way or another.

*Although he's always willing to talk football, Weinmeister invariably returns to his work.*

People outside still think of the Teamsters as truck drivers. They are now the smallest percentage of our overall membership. We have 55,000 members in our Joint Council. I think the warehouse, production and food employees are the largest group.

Nationally, we're a 2-million-member organization. In our master freight agreement, which covers the drivers, we now have maybe 275,000 members.

We're everywhere—bakeries, production plants, nursing homes, retail stores, almost any job you can name.

One of my favorite labor stories was told by a dear, departed friend, Ray Moyer, who used to represent Hiram Walker distillers. He'd been transferred to Mill Valley, California, and I had started to work for the Teamsters in Oakland, and since we'd been friends and neighbors up here, he was trying to locate me.

Ray got hold of a large trucking local down there, Local 70, dialed the number and when the phone was picked up the guy said, "What's your beef?" (laugh).

Ray never could get over that. He told the story a thousand times. The guy didn't say, "Hello," or "How are you," just, "What's your beef?"

And I thought to myself at the time, "Well, that's what my business is." ●

#### NONTARIFF BARRIERS ON BEEF IMPORTS

**HON. HANK BROWN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Japan

should dismantle its nontariff barriers to beef imports.

Japan maintains strict barriers against U.S. beef imports. One of the major barriers is a quota system that currently limits imports of high quality beef—most of which is produced in the United States—to 30,800 tons a year.

These barriers are injurious and unfair to our beef producers, who are prevented from developing a market with unusual potential for expansion. These barriers are contributing to a trade deficit with Japan that reached \$18 billion last year. These barriers violate the principles of fair trade established in the General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) to which Japan is a signatory.

While the Japanese have relatively open access to our markets, they put unfair limits on our products going to Japan. As a result, beef in Japan costs up to three times what it does in the United States.

The Japanese beef market has an unusually large potential for expansion, due to the fact that beef currently is so small a part of the Japanese diet. The average Japanese eats approximately one-tenth as much meat as Americans do. An open beef market in Japan would bring more aggressive marketing, as well as lower beef prices for the Japanese consumer.

In 1978, the Japanese agreed to a gradual increase in their beef import quotas. This agreement will expire on March 31, 1984. Negotiations are currently in progress to extend this agreement. U.S. negotiators are asking for additional quota increases with the goal of total elimination of beef quotas.

The Congress of the United States must send a clear signal to Japan—and to our trade negotiators—that these barriers to fair trade will not be tolerated.

Senator Max Baucus and I are introducing concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress that U.S. trade negotiators insist that Japan dismantle all nontariff barriers to U.S. beef imports. Failing that, the resolutions call on the U.S. trade representative to seek appropriate relief under United States and international law.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will cosponsor and support this resolution. ●

#### THE FUTILITY OF WAR

**HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post ran a column by Richard Cohen on January 23, 1984, which provides an interesting perspec-

tive on the escalation of tensions between the superpowers, and the way that some defense executives looked at this situation. It is worthwhile to note that these individuals, who are undoubtedly supporters of a strong national defense, cautioned restraint and negotiations during a crisis simulation conducted by the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies. I think that President Reagan would do well to take the advice of these experts seriously. I comment this article to President Reagan and to my colleagues in Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 1984]

#### DEFENSE CONTRACTORS COULD TEACH OFFICIALS ABOUT WAR'S FUTILITY

(By Richard Cohen)

The crisis began when the Palestine Liberation Organization simultaneously attacked Israeli civilian settlements on the West Bank and blew up an Israeli military headquarters in southern Lebanon—killing both the visiting Israeli defense minister and the chief of staff.

It escalated when terrorists sneaked into the Pentagon through its underground tunnels and set off an explosion. Then Iran, always unpredictable, inexplicably sank two oil tankers, closing the Strait of Hormuz, blocking the flow of oil to the West. America mobilized. The Soviet Union countered. War seemed inevitable.

But no one would fight. At least that's what happened when a Washington think tank, the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, held a war game recently.

Its players were corporate executives from around the country, many employed by defense contractors—just the types, the planners thought, who would fight a war. They were told they were advisers to the president. They told the president to negotiate.

Their response was something of a surprise to the strategic thinkers who had planned the exercise. They anticipated that defense executives, of all people, would counsel the president to turn on the military pressure—send a fleet here, the Marines there and maybe give the Ayatollah Khomeini the martyrdom he richly deserves. Nothing doing, though. They all told the president to talk with the Soviets.

This, though, was a game. But as Fred Kaplan reminds us, the same thing happened in real life. Kaplan, author of "The Wizards of Armageddon," recounts in his book that during the Berlin crisis of 1961, the White House reluctantly reached the conclusion that no war with the Soviet Union could, in realistic terms, be won.

Back then, Kaplan writes, the United States had the Soviet Union incredibly outgunned. Instead of the Soviets having the almost 1,000 ICBMs Kennedy had once thought, it was discovered that they had four—and those would have taken hours to be made operational. Nevertheless, the White House was told that even an overwhelming American strike at Soviet air bases and missile installations could not guarantee complete success. Some Soviet bombers would probably get through. America would surely win; if you count losing 10 to 15 million people winning.

Now, though, things are dramatically different. The Soviet Union has 1,400 land-based missiles; the United States 1,052. The



Soviet Union has 7,750 strategic warheads; the United States 9,975. Our Missile superiority is a thing of the past. And regardless of how many missiles or warheads are added to the arsenals of either nation, a horrible parity has been achieved. Either nation can obliterate the other.

So what, you might ask, is the point of new missiles—the MX in this country and the Pershings being installed in Europe? The answer was provided by the executives who recommended negotiations with the Soviets. There is no point. The additional weapons provide neither additional security nor any tactical advantage. They are too horrible to be used. And as horrible as they are, they are even more horrible when you consider that they will be answered in kind.

Tragically, the reality that confronted the game-players has eluded both the Soviet and U.S. governments. They both seem addicted to nuclear missiles, although neither knows what to do with them or is talking to the other about reducing them. Both the Geneva and the Vienna arms talks are in suspension while we and the Soviets huff, puff and posture. The immediate cause for the breach was the installation of the Pershings—missiles that serve none but a political purpose and add nothing but redundancy to our deterrent capabilities.

The nuclear armament issue is, of course, more complicated than that—but it is also that simple. The executives who played at war had some knowledge of the subject, but not the expertise of defense intellectuals. Yet they quickly realized that there is no longer such a thing as nuclear superiority or, for that matter, a winnable war.

In reality, as in simulation, the game is over.●

#### THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARTYRDOM OF JAN PALACH

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, January 19 marked the 15th anniversary of the martyrdom of Jan Palach. On that day, the 21-year-old Prague philosophy student died in support of liberty in Eastern Europe. Three days earlier, Palach had set himself on fire in protest of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. January 25, 1968, was an unofficial day of mourning that saw tens of thousands of Czech citizens participate in the funeral march on St. Wenceslaus Square.

We honor his memory today not only as an inspiration to enslaved people around the world, but as a warning to their oppressors. The courage and dedication of this young man survives to this day in the people of Czechoslovakia and other enslaved countries. Lech Walesa in Poland is of the same spirit of Jan Palach, as are the freedom fighters of Afghanistan. These are leaders who, like Palach, are willing to fight any battle and make any sacrifice in support of freedom. Dictators everywhere must be put on notice that freedom-loving peoples

such as the Czechs and the Poles will not stand by while their liberties are stripped away. Let us hope that their fight against tyranny championed by Jan Palach, Lech Walesa, and other courageous men and women is soon won.

The memory of Jan Palach lives on in the minds of oppressed people everywhere. Let his example continue until all people are free of the despotism Palach died resisting.●

#### DEFICIT SUMMIT

**HON. JAMES R. JONES**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of Congress, two of our distinguished colleagues have made important calls for immediate action on the deficit. Majority Leader JIM WRIGHT, a Democrat from Texas, and Ed ZSCHAU, a Republican from California, have come separately to a conclusion I share.

This Nation needs an immediate, bipartisan summit meeting including the President, Speaker O'NEILL, and the congressional leadership of both parties. That meeting should be at a place where true work and negotiations can occur and not just rhetoric.

A deficit reduction agreement concentrating on military spending, non-means tested entitlements, and revenues should be hammered out and accepted by all parties.

That must be done this year.

If it is not done, deficits are likely to rise to more than \$300 billion by 1989. Such deficits will drive up interest rates, destroy the recovery, wreck our export industries and ruin our productivity.

It is important to note here that the call for a summit comes not from Democrats or from Republicans alone. It comes from responsible members of both parties.

The House already has passed legislation on a domestic economic summit. That bill, which I sponsored, has 105 cosponsors from both parties.

It is time now for the Senate to act on this legislation and for the President to convene a summit. We must act now. Next year may be too late.

Following are excerpts from the speech by Majority Leader WRIGHT and the article by Congressman ZSCHAU:

ADDRESS OF HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER JIM WRIGHT ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 24, 1984

The American people know that we cannot indefinitely continue to mortgage our children's futures with annual deficits in the range of \$200 billion.

We cannot afford to indulge ourselves the expensive luxury of a tax cut which adds \$135 billion to the already astronomical

annual deficit, and put it on our grandchildren's bill.

In 1980, President Reagan was elected on the promise to balance the budget by 1983. But the 1983 deficit was the highest in history—three times higher than the worst suffered under any previous administration.

How serious are the Reagan deficits? They add more to the national debt in four years than all seven post-war administrations from Truman through Carter added in 35 years.

Before 1981 the annual deficit always consumed less than 2 percent of the gross national product for the year. Last year it consumed 6 percent.

In the past three years we have borrowed nearly \$500 billion from our grandchildren or our great-grandchildren to help finance about \$600 billion in current military spending.

Last year in the Budget Reconciliation bill, the House adopted a provision which directs the President to convene a summit meeting, to be composed of himself and the bipartisan leadership of both houses of Congress. This group would be directed to develop an across-the-board adjustment in the three things most responsible for the deficits—revenue losses, military spending growth, and entitlement spending growth—sufficient to reduce the projected deficit for the coming year by at least one-half.

The Senate has not acted on that bill. Today I call upon the Senate to pass that legislation, with that mandate intact. I call upon the president to sign it, to convene the meeting, and to join us in an honest acknowledgement of the enormity of the problem in order that together we may begin to solve it.

Obviously something needs to be done. And it needs to be done this year.

Rhetoric will not suffice. Stonewalling the excessive tax windfalls for the wealthy and threatening to veto any adjustment will not get the job done. Refusing to acknowledge the role of military spending as a major contributor to the deficit will not avail.

Simply blaming these gaping deficits on imaginary increases in domestic spending will not wash. Martin Feldstein knows that is not true. David Stockman knows that it is not true. George Will knows that is not true.

If Ronald Reagan does not know that is not true, there is something seriously wrong in the White House.

#### DEFICIT REQUIRES SURPLUS OF POLITICAL COURAGE

(By Ed Zschau)

Although 1984 should be a banner year for the U.S. economy, fasten your seat belts for another rocky economic slide in 1985-86 unless we in Congress and those in the White House get personality transplants in the next 90 days. If the rascals like me in Washington can't muster up some political courage early in the upcoming (election) year, you'll be back in the economic soup.

I have mixed feelings about the economy's current good performance: It's wonderful except that it lulls us into a euphoric state. The annual GNP growth rate recently has been 6 to 7 percent. Housing starts are up 70 percent over last year and domestic auto sales are expanding. The index of leading economic indicators has climbed consistently each month for the past year, unemployment has fallen to 8.4 percent (faster and farther than most predicted) and inflation

has been held in check—below 5 percent. So, what's the worry?

#### STREAM OF DEFICITS

The worry—really the danger—is the stream of \$200 billion annual federal deficits as far as the eye can see. They are unprecedented, not just in their magnitude, but because they are expected to increase—or at least not decrease—during a period of improving economic conditions. As such, they can't be explained away as the "normal effect of an economic slowdown." Rather, they result from a total absence of fiscal responsibility—Congress and the White House wanting to spend far more on you than we're willing to tax you. It's that, pure and simple.

If we don't make substantial reductions in federal deficits, interest rates will be driven up, the hard-fought and costly gains against inflation will be lost and the fragile economic recovery that we're currently enjoying will be short-lived.

Curiously, most people in and out of Washington—except those "avant garde" economists whose theories defy reality—agree with this analysis. The debate has not been whether these deficits will destroy the recovery. The debate has been whether its destruction will begin to take place before or after the November 1984 elections. Because it's unlikely that we'll see signs of the next recession in 1984, we can expect politicians to speak out harshly against deficits in 1984 but wait until 1985 (or later) before facing up to the problem.

#### TIME TO ACT

But this is dumb and irresponsible. Waiting will worsen the problem and increase the pain of solving it. In a faltering economy it's harder to take the always difficult actions of reducing spending and increasing taxes. Therefore, the time to act is now, when we have the momentum of the recovery to help us.

The key to making substantial decreases in the deficits is the willingness to seek spending cuts throughout the entire budget (defense and entitlements that compose three-fourths of our expenditures can't be "off limits") and to enact appropriate tax increases. We can't solve the deficit problem by cutting only discretionary domestic spending, through cuts there are still possible.

Happily, with the momentum of the recovery, we can get leverage out of our efforts to reduce the deficit. Let's suppose we cut the spending growth in 1985 by \$30 billion (\$8 billion in defense, \$15 billion in entitlements and \$7 billion elsewhere) and increase taxes by \$20 billion. That would reduce federal borrowing by \$50 billion or 1.2 percent of the Gross National Product. The extra \$50 billion available for private borrowing, plus the reduced expectations for inflation, could result in interest rates falling 1 to 2 percent. That alone would save \$10 billion in interest on the national debt. It might also have a favorable effect on employment. A one-half percent greater reduction in unemployment throughout the year would reduce the deficit by about another \$15 billion. The total impact could be a \$75-billion deficit reduction. That would send a strong signal to financial markets and business that future prospects for lower interest rates and economic growth are bright.

#### FEAR OF FALLING

What's stopping us from acting? It's fear—the fear that the proposals we make to cut spending or raise taxes will be used against us in our election campaigns. Concern for

our own political skins prevents us from acting responsibly. Clearly, taking the proper fiscal actions is a political problem rather than a budget or tax policy dilemma.

Accordingly, the solution must be a political solution. I'm optimistic because I believe the American people now understand that our present course will damage the economy for everyone. I believe they're ready to sacrifice individually to create a strong economic future so long as everyone shares the sacrifice fairly. But we politicians must act.

#### SPREAD THE WEALTH OF BLAME

The political solution requires depoliticizing the deficit reduction issue. To avoid partisan finger pointing, we've got to get everyone's fingerprints on spending cuts and tax increases.

One way is for the president to call a major economic summit meeting attended by the leadership of both parties in the Senate and House, his Cabinet and advisers, and Chairman Paul Volcker of the Federal Reserve Board. It should be held in a secluded spot such as Camp David, away from the press, to promote open discussion. The summit should continue until a consensus plan is developed to make a significant reduction in the 1985 deficit—\$50 billion or more.

You can help. Tell your congressmen, senators and the president to put politics aside and do what's right for the nation's future prosperity. The tough part: Tell them that you would support cuts in your own favorite government programs (name them) and increases in your taxes as part of a comprehensive and fair program to achieve significant deficit reductions in 1985 and beyond.

Let's do what's right for a change. ●

#### THE MANZIEL OIL PALACE

#### HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. RALPH M. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Tyler oilman Bobby Manziel, Jr. saw his father's dream come true last month with the opening of the Oil Palace, the largest sports arena between Dallas and Shreveport, 28 years after construction began.

Manziel had his dream in 1955. He dreamed of a stadium to seat 20,000 people, be managed by heavyweight champion Jack Dempsey and rival Madisons Square Garden in size and splendor. Manziel died in 1956, 3 months before completion.

It sat nearly dormant until 1968 when Manziel's son, Bobby, Jr. bought it and used it commercially. This year, the building was completed.

An engineering marvel, the Oil Palace is built entirely of brick with no inner columns or beams to support the domed roof. It will be booked for sporting events, concert, and trade shows.

A Lebanese immigrant, Manziel became a bantamweight professional boxer and, somewhere early in his career, he met Jack Dempsey. In 1932, the east Texas oil boom drew Manziel to Tyler. Dempsey loaned Manziel

\$400 for his first oil lease and the well became a gusher. His discovery of nine major oil fields made him one of the richest men in Texas. His love for boxing never ceased and Manziel and Dempsey remained friends until Manziel's death.

I commend Bobby Manziel, Jr. for seeing that his father's dream came true—and for making the Oil Palace an east Texas landmark—known nationwide for sporting events.

Surely this dutiful son can look up and somehow see a smile on his dad's face—and on the face of the old Manasa Mauler.

I am proud of Bobby, Jr., Tyler is proud, Texas is proud—and sports fans everywhere will be reminded that old dreams do sometimes come true. ●

#### THE IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ARTS TO A COMPLETE EDUCATION

#### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert this distinguished body to the House joint resolution, introduced today by Mr. DOWNEY and myself, that recognizes the important contribution of the arts to a complete education.

As chairman and vice-chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, my colleague and I believe that this legislation will lead to the recognition of the need to promote arts education in our Nation's schools.

Few of us here would dispute that artistic expression and appreciation promote confidence, intellectual challenge and emotional well-being in our society. But we legislators must recognize that art will not continue to be such an important element unless we commit ourselves to putting it back into our children's education.

We are currently ignoring our responsibility to our children to provide them the opportunity to explore and develop their artistic talents and interests. Fiscal year 1982 was the last year that the Federal Government provided grants specifically for arts in education. Similarly, we have essentially level funded the only other two national programs of this nature, the Kennedy education program and the National Committee on the Arts for the Handicapped. In short, we legislators have not recognized the importance of arts in education, and we have neglected our responsibility to its continuation.

People will argue that art will never die, and they are correct. There will always be talented people. However, without introduction, instruction, encouragement, and criticism, talent will



not develop into creative ability. There is a need for professionally qualified teachers to help students become artistically literate. Schools must have sequential curriculums to develop the skills and knowledge that artists need in order to develop their talents.

This Nation is only beginning to realize these needs. The National Commission on Excellence in Education's, "A Nation at Risk" clearly states that the arts are included in the six basics essential to a complete education. The College Board and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching also published studies that cite the importance of arts in education. I firmly believe that it is time we legislators do the same.

In closing, then, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my distinguished colleagues to take note of this resolution—to recognize the issue it addresses, and to assume the responsible it calls for.●

#### A MEANINGFUL PEACE

**HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, last night President Reagan outlined his perception of a lasting and meaningful peace.

Americans resort to force only when we must. But in the post-Vietnam era, our Government did not act at times when it should have, on behalf of peace and freedom in the world. The image of America was that of a pitiful, helpless giant whose nose could be twitted by a Khomeini or Qadhafi with impunity.

But no more. Ronald Reagan has brought meaning back into the word "peace." Peace does not just mean the absence of war. You could say that during President Carter's and Vice President Mondale's years in office, America was at peace. But can any one call that time of the Iran crisis, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua peaceful? Did peace have any real meaning then?

Under President Reagan, we have not been afraid to use force judiciously. We have a more credible deterrent to Soviet aggression today under Reagan than when Carter and Mondale left office.

We now have the will, Mr. Speaker, and the people know it. They believe in a strong America as a force for peace, and so we have supported President Reagan in most of his initiatives for peace. I trust we have turned back from the fear of using our strength. Peace through strength, and negotiating from strength, have given us the meaningful peace President Reagan spoke of. They will continue to serve

us well should Ronald Reagan be returned for another 4 years as our Nation's leader.●

#### WEAKENED PROTECTION FROM FALSE ADVERTISING CONDEMNED

**HON. JAMES J. FLORIO**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the administration majority at the Federal Trade Commission recently issued a statement reflecting a more permissive attitude toward false advertising and other deceptive practices. This initiative is particularly troubling because the Commission is attempting to do administratively what it recently tried unsuccessfully to get Congress to do by legislation.

This controversy was well summarized in a recent column by Sylvia Porter, which I am here inserting in the RECORD.

#### NEW POLICY ON DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING ERODES CONSUMER PROTECTION (By Sylvia Porter)

It's like conducting a complete physical exam in order to prescribe an aspirin. That's one critic's description of the recent Federal Trade Commission (FTC) policy change under which it is much more difficult to prove claims of deceptive advertising and to find certain advertising claims illegal. In essence, it represents a new erosion of consumer protection, a continuation of this administration's attitude toward consumer rights overall.

The policy, adopted by a vote of 3 to 2, sets new guidelines for deciding whether an advertisement is deceptive. Under the new guidelines, a "reasonable" consumer will have to have suffered injury or some other, unspecified ill effect as a result of the ad. Previously, the FTC could take action against ads that appeared to deceive consumers, without proving injury or restricting the ads to "reasonable" individuals.

The commission contends its ability to protect consumers remains undiminished—but oh, no! Its argument that it can now focus more successfully on real problems of deceptive advertising that face consumers is "deceptive" on the face of it.

For the irony is that in recent years, the FTC has used its powers with increasing timidity. The emphasis has shifted from aggressive efforts to clamp down on deceptive advertising practices to a policy in which no effort seems to be spared to avoid actions that could be interpreted by business as harassment. In brief: In case of doubt, throw it out.

Merely a glance at the number of tests handed in all categories of action on ads confirms this trend: 12 in 1980; 18 in 1981; 9 in 1982 (new administration); 16 in 1983; to date in fiscal 1984, a puny 2.

When the commission files a complaint against an advertiser, a long, drawn-out procedure follows that can end in a consent agreement or court injunction (to name only two possibilities).

According to an FTC spokesman, a deception now has to be "material"—that is, make

a negative difference to you, the consumer. It's not clear whether an actual injury must be demonstrated. It appears that the commission is narrowing its focus to cases where a problem exists and trying to avoid cases in which no one is hurt. Sounds fine—if you accept the commission's claim that the previous standard was so broad that it inhibited advertisers from providing more information because they feared the vague prohibitions against deception.

By narrowing the definition, according to this view, advertisers can clearly see whether their ads will or will not be considered deceptive and can thus provide additional information to help you, the consumer.

If you are not completely persuaded by this argument, you'll find your self in illustrious company. Of the five members of the FTC, two weren't persuaded of the advisability of changing the standard—and this is just one indication. Commissioners Michael Pertschuk, a Democrat who chaired the FTC under President Carter, and Patricia Bailey, a Republican member, voted against the change in policy.

In Congress, some members are sufficiently disturbed to be planning hearings on the matter, perhaps early next year. Rep. James J. Florio, D-N.J., who chairs a House Subcommittee that oversees the FTC, and Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich., who chairs the full House Energy and Commerce Committee, issued strong statements of dismay at what they view as defiance of the intentions of Congress on the FTC all along.

A year ago, in fact, the commission's chairman, James C. Miller 3rd, a Reagan appointee, tried to push Congress into passing legislation that would have made the same policy change the commission has just made itself. Consumer groups, along with commissioners Bailey and Pertschuk, successfully opposed that scheme.

The FTC has now accomplished by administrative fiat what Congress flatly turned down.

If the net effect is a cut in the number of consumer complaints to the commission, a top consumer watchdog will have been defanged. If the FTC takes the view that false advertising hurts legitimate business more than it hurts you, the consumer, the watchdog will have not only lost its fangs but also its bite and bark. This is the unmistakable trend.●

#### MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

**HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, after attending an oversight hearing on the Inter-American Foundation, I feel compelled to join my colleagues in lamenting the turn that the Foundation seems to have taken under the current administration.

I listened as each of the witnesses failed to address, with any degree of seriousness, the most fundamental question concerning the Foundation: Will it continue to exist as one of this country's finest examples of a grassroots, bottom up economic develop-

ment institution, with programs targeted to the poor in the Caribbean and Latin America who are most in need of such assistance.

I came away from the hearing with the uneasy feeling that the Foundation was in imminent danger of fulfilling my worst fear, the fear that it would become an institution concerned with short-term, politically expedient economic assistance, to the total detriment of fundamental long-term development goals.

This cannot be allowed to happen. I urge my colleagues here in the Congress to go on the record in every possible way as being opposed to the politicization of the Foundation.

The Foundation's purposes should not be subverted. The Foundation should continue, unencumbered by partisan or ideological concerns, to implement programs consistent with its legislatively mandated goal of providing "support for developmental activities . . . to achieve conditions in the Western Hemisphere under which the dignity and the worth of each human person will be respected and under which all men will be afforded the opportunity to develop their potential to seek through gainful and productive work the fulfillment of their aspirations for a better life." ●

#### LOCAL MUSICIAN DONATES MUSIC TO AREA SCHOOLS

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent contribution of two original jazz compositions and a brass ensemble work by my constituent, Mr. Ross Anderson, to Steinmetz High School and Wright College, both located in Chicago, and to the U.S. Navy School of Music.

Mr. Anderson contributed these works in a gesture of thanks for his years of education at these institutions, and he hopes that these compositions will serve as an inspiration for aspiring musicians.

Mr. Anderson's original compositions have been performed in Europe and the United States, and he has traveled across the country for 10 years with the "Ross Anderson Band."

I congratulate Ross Anderson on his achievements in his profession, and especially commend him for his generosity to the community and his dedication to the field of music.

His example is an inspiration to others, and at this point in the RECORD, I would like to include an article from a November 1983 edition of the Passage paper entitled, "Artist Conducts Melody of Musical Thanks

to Area Schools," which reports on Mr. Anderson's unique donation of music.

The article follows:

#### ARTIST CONDUCTS MELODY OF MUSICAL THANKS TO AREA SCHOOLS

(By Mary Pat Byrne)

A local artist is giving back to local schools a bit of what he took from them. Ross Anderson, of the 6000 block of N. Austin, calls Steinmetz High School, Wright College and the U.S. Navy School of Music his alma maters. To honor them, he recently donated two books of original jazz compositions and a brass ensemble work to their music departments.

His original compositions have been performed in Europe and across the U.S. The first time an orchestra performed from Anderson's compositions though, was at Wright College, back when the composer was a book-toting college student. Anderson admits that the performance was most memorable.

"When I was at Wright, I did a composition for their jazz band. You always enjoy hearing or reading something of your own. It's exciting!" he explained. It's also exciting to be able to add former students' creative achievements to your music library, according to Wright College President Ernest V. Clements who sent a letter of gratitude to the musician for his unique donation.

After completing his studies, Anderson left the northwest side to travel across the country for 10 years with the "Ross Anderson Band." He returned in the 1970's to write, teach and record. Anderson is currently working in educational publishing, back in the neighborhood where he grew up.

For today's aspiring musicians, Anderson encourages them to choose a musical career. "If they have the talent, there are a lot of opportunities for them—a lot more than there were a few years ago," he said.

Local music students at Wright and Steinmetz can now use some of this professional musician's work as inspiration. The two books of original compositions and the brass ensemble work entitled "Blast for Brass," are available for their use.

When asked whether students can look for additional works by Anderson, the musician and composer replied, "I'll probably do it again. I'm working on new things all the time." ●

#### MASSACHUSETTS WELCOMES ARCHBISHOP BERNARD F. LAW

#### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 24, 1984, the appointment of Bishop Bernard F. Law as the eighth leader of the Nation's third largest archdiocese was announced in Boston. I join with my fellow Catholics of Boston and the citizens of the entire commonwealth in wishing Archbishop Law every success and blessing as he undertakes the responsibilities of spiritual leadership in our State and region. Archbishop Law follows in the path of the eminent and charismatic Cardinal Rich-

ard Cushing and of the kind and respected Cardinal Humberto Medeiros. During the time between the untimely death of Cardinal Medeiros and the new appointment, the archdiocese has been ably administered by the Most Reverend Thomas V. Daily, who has warmly introduced Archbishop Law to his new flock.

Archbishop Law comes to us from the diocese of Springfield-Cape Girardeau in Missouri, but he is no stranger to Boston. He holds undergraduate and law degrees from Harvard University, and he has returned often as a lecturer. More important, it appears that the Holy Father Pope John Paul II recognized the deep understanding of the American people that Archbishop Law has gained from his experiences all over this Nation.

Beginning with his work in Jackson, Miss., after his ordination to the priesthood in 1961, Archbishop Law has established a consistent and solid commitment to civil rights. He has written, preached and taught often of the human values reflected and nurtured in the family. He has defended peace and stressed the importance of tolerance. He has provided a model of humility but has not shied away from straightforward statements of spiritual and moral principles.

Archbishop Law will be formally installed on Friday, March 23, 1984, at a ceremony in Holy Cross Cathedral in Boston. I extend my sincere welcome to the new Archbishop, and I eagerly anticipate his leadership and involvement in our community. ●

#### EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LEGISLATION

#### HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment compensation passed by Congress in October was and is inadequate to the needs of America's long-term unemployed.

Because of opposition from the Senate and the administration, the House agreed to a weakening of its strong reachback provisions which would have added people laid off for more than a year.

While the legislation extending the Federal supplemental compensation program was better than nothing, this House should remain aware of the serious defects in Federal unemployment compensation law.

Both the permanent extended benefits program and the quasi-temporary FSC program are triggered to the insured unemployment rate, a measure of severity of unemployment which has proven enormously inappropriate during periods of deep and prolonged



recession as we experienced in the period 1981-83. The use of IUR produces the anomaly that the longer the recession, the lower the IUR.

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 gutted the extended benefits program. At present, only unemployed persons in Puerto Rico and Alaska are receiving EB. In about half of the States, unemployed persons receive only the minimum number of benefits under FSC—8 weeks.

The House this year should reform the Federal unemployment program.

As an interim measure, we should act to alleviate those who are unemployed now and who have been unemployed a year, 2 years, and even longer, as have thousands of iron ore miners in my district.

President Reagan's state of the Union message, while touching just about every subject here on Earth and in outer space, gave little intention to the brave men and women struggling to cope with the tragedy of long-term unemployment. Optimistic about the future, the President was characteristically vague about the present.

I am today introducing legislation to address the immediate, specific and painful problems of those who are now unemployed. My bill which would increase eligibility under the FSC program by 6 weeks.

It would increase benefit weeks for current and future FSC recipients and would provide reach-back for unemployed Americans who have suffered as the result of both the recession and the inadequacies in the unemployment compensation program.

I urge Members to join with me in cosponsoring this legislation.●

#### WHO WRITES THE BUDGET?

#### HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan yesterday proposed a bipartisan commission to find ways to make a downpayment on the Federal deficit. This constructive approach was answered with statements warning the President not to attempt to turn blame for deficit away from where that blame really lies.

Now we all know who is responsible for the deficit—it is this body, the Congress, which passes the budget. Since the 1974 Budget Act, Budget Committees in both Houses of Congress have ostensibly been working to control spending. The sea of red ink indicates we have not done our job very well.

The blame is squarely on our shoulders. Last year on September 22, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, told the House, and I quote:

Congress makes the budget; the President does not. That is a very important distinction.

Now imagine my surprise when our distinguished Speaker went on television yesterday and told us that the President makes the budget, not Congress.

Who is responsible for the budget? Whoever is, is also responsible for the deficit.●

#### MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

#### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to increase the authorization for appropriations for the maternal and child health services block grant program (MCH) from the current \$373 million to \$499,500,000. This figure will allow the program to respond to the critical needs of low-income mothers and children.

The maternal and child health block grant allots funds to the States to promote the health of low-income mothers and children by providing prevention and primary care services to children and prenatal, delivery, and postpartum care for mothers; 85 percent of the block grant is used for allocations to the States, while 15 percent is set aside for use in special projects of regional and national significance.

Although the infant mortality rate has continued to fall steadily throughout the past 30 years, a study by the children's defense fund (CDF) reports that in 1982 the death rate for all infants rose in 11 States. In addition, the 1983 annual report by the Department of Health and Human Services shows an alarmingly high and disparate infant death rate between blacks and whites. The women and children served by this program are the most exposed group in our society, and their health reflects directly the health of the entire Nation. MCH can provide the type of thorough care to combat these problems.

In both the past 2 years we have surpassed the authorization level for MCH. This legislation therefore provides a vehicle not only to address that trend, but allows room in which for us to respond to these people and the rising concern for infant death rates.

As part of this legislation I have also asked that there be authorized \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 1985 for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC). This program provides supplemental food, nutrition information, and prenatal care to mothers, infants, and children who qualify as low-income individuals and are shown to suffer nu-

tritional risk. The \$1.5 billion figure is consistent with past years' incremental increases.

Hunger and its effects are a problem in this country. In my own State the department of public health has shown that a significant number of low-income, preschool children suffer one or more signs of malnutrition. At the same time, a study covering such diverse areas as California, Minnesota, Michigan, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania has uncovered the growing numbers of Americans who are underfed and undernourished.

The WIC program is a proven defense against chronic malnutrition, and one of the most effective and essential programs run by this Government. A study by the Harvard School of Public Health showed not only a marked decrease in the incidence of low birth weight by those enrolled in the WIC program, but also that each dollar spent on the kind of prenatal care that WIC provides saves \$3 in future infant hospitalization costs. Would that every program we run was as broadly and clearly beneficial as this one. I urge you all to support this legislation and the sound, solid investment it makes in the future of this country.●

#### U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN BROWNSVILLE, TEX., IS OVERBURDENED

#### HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of facilitating the judicial process in the south Texas Rio Grande Valley area, I am today introducing legislation which would create a Federal district court within the southern district court system of Texas.

It has become increasingly evident that the existing U.S. district court in Brownsville, Tex., is overburdened. The large caseload statistics for that court, and the accompanying magistrate activity, are due to the extraordinary population growth in the Rio Grande Valley during the last decade.

In the area, the Brownsville court serves Willacy, Cameron, Hidalgo, and Starr Counties. The legislation which I am today introducing would create another U.S. district court to exclusively serve judicial needs in Hidalgo and Starr Counties, allowing the Brownsville court to serve Willacy and Cameron Counties.

This new court would reside in McAllen in Hidalgo County. At present, the Brownsville court handles nearly half of all judicial action originating in Hidalgo and Starr Counties—

and the creation of a McAllen court would ease the Brownsville caseload.

As well, there will be a savings of nearly \$24,000 in expenses associated with juror transportation to the Brownsville court, not to mention the reduced security headaches of transporting prisoners from Hidalgo and Starr Counties down to Brownsville for trial.

Economy, security, and caseload reduction are all factors which speak in favor of a McAllen division of the southern district court system of Texas. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues will give their serious consideration to my bill in the interest of a more orderly judicial process in my area.●

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE VISTA OF OUTER SPACE PROGRAM

**HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend President Reagan for his farsighted vision of the new frontier offered to this Nation by the great vista of outer space. In the state of the Union address last night, President Reagan announced a comprehensive plan for space, with three major initiatives: First, the President proposed that we build a permanently manned space station so that Americans can live and work in space within a decade; second, he extended an invitation to America's friends and allies to participate in the space station program; and, third he promised us a program to stimulate cooperation by Government and industry in developing the full commercial potential of space.

When the President directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to begin the development of the space station immediately, he put this Nation back on the map where space is concerned. A space station will stimulate new technologies and enhance U.S. productivity. Construction of a space station will finally demonstrate that we have found, once again, our leadership role in space. Construction of a space station will make possible the exploration and conquest of yet a new frontier, the final frontier of space. And, just as importantly, a space station will give us new and unexplored capabilities as we set about a systematic exploration of the universe in the years ahead.

A space station will serve as a national scientific and technological laboratory in space for industry and government. A space station will serve as an operation base, a base from which satellites can be serviced and large structures assembled. And, a space sta-

tion will serve as base for future space initiatives.

I commend the President on this initiative, for I strongly believe in the long-term economic importance and value of space to our Nation. And, the simple fact is that a space station is not only the next logical step in our space program, but it also represents a sound economic investment in our own future.

Mr. Speaker, historically, an investment in space and space-related technologies has been one of the soundest economic investments we have ever made. For every \$1 we have invested, we have gotten a return of approximately \$7 to \$14. Clearly, spending money on our space program generates income for our Nation.

Our space program also generates many jobs for our Nation's people; it is estimated that by the year 2000, commercial space activities may be worth as much as \$200 to \$300 billion to our national economy and may account for as many as 10 million jobs. The space program is also a people program. It provides jobs and opportunities today and insures us of a competitive posture in the international arena in the years ahead. And, furthermore, as anyone who has read anything about the Apollo program can tell you, our space program provides us with a strong sense of national identity and prestige.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to lend my full support to the space station initiative and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to do the same. There is nothing but good that can come out of it. This new initiative will be an important building block for our house of national prosperity; it is indeed worthy of the wholehearted bipartisan support of this Congress.●

#### WE HAVE A SPENDING GAP— NOT A REVENUE GAP

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President reminded this body that whether we reduce Federal deficit spending through raising taxes or borrowing from the private sector, this Government is still spending too much of our Nation's wealth.

In the 15 years before Ronald Reagan was elected, Federal taxes had grown so much that they had nearly quadrupled. In just the 5 years before his inauguration, Federal tax revenues actually doubled—and he still inherited a deficit from the Carter-Mondale administration.

We do not have a revenue gap. We have a spending gap between what the Government takes in and what this Congress spends each year.

We cannot tax away the deficit and balance this budget on the backs of ordinary working people whose tax burden has grown through the record inflation and bracket creep of the past decade.

We have to take a hard look at the so-called uncontrollable elements of the budget—now estimated at approximately 75 percent of all Federal spending.

We have to admit that our spending and taxing policies have been unfair to working Americans. While we tied cost-of-living increases to almost all Federal entitlement programs during the last decade, beginning with the retired pay of Federal civil servants, we denied the same relief to taxpayers. Their taxes have yet to be indexed to inflation, which thanks to the President will finally take place in 1985. But now just as promise of relief from the unfair policies of the past is finally in sight, my Democratic colleagues on the stump and in this Chamber want to rob working people of the same benefits of indexing they have already given to those who receive benefits from their hard-earned tax dollars.

The Grace Commission has identified 2,500 areas where \$424 billion can be saved in the next 4 years. We owe it to the taxpayers to take a hard look at each of those 2,500 suggestions for reducing the deficit before we take away indexing of taxes to inflation.●

#### AN EXAMPLE OF EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

**HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education and other recently issued studies have spurred our reexamination as a nation of the challenges facing education and of the ways in which our Nation's schools are responding to those challenges. As we participate in this assessment and strive to perfect our schools, we need examples of excellence before us. The realization of excellence requires, first, the understanding of its qualities and the imagination of its possibility.

Today, I wish to share with you one example of excellence in education—Wahlert High School, in Dubuque, Iowa, on the occasion of Wahlert High's 25th anniversary.

Located in the oldest established city west of the Mississippi River, Wahlert High School was founded in 1959. Dedicated to its primary benefactor, Mr. Harry Wahlert, the school fulfills and exceeds the high ideals we as a nation hold for education. The Wahlert education is a complete one, merg-



ing academics, the fine arts, extracurricular activities, athletics, and religious studies in devotion to the concept of the whole person. Education at Wahlert is value centered, with the goal of helping each individual grow not only in mind but also in spirit.

Each year, Wahlert High's administrators set a theme to guide the school's activities. Recent themes of excellence, service, and community epitomize the Wahlert experience. The Wahlert community—students, parents, faculty, and administrators—take these themes to heart and realize them through reaching outward to make an impact on the surrounding community and on society as a whole through such activities as an annual Service Day and through a host of other outreach activities.

Wahlert High School helps foster, in the Dubuque community, the diversity which has traditionally characterized American education and which, through the partnership of the public and private schools, has strengthened education in America overall.

As a Wahlert alumnus, I have had the privilege of experiencing excellence in education. I have profited from the commitment of the Wahlert community to the development of the whole person. I am one of the over 10,000 students who received from Wahlert the opportunity to develop to our fullest potential, our minds, our hearts, and our spirits.

As we assess the state of education in America and set forth goals and plans for achieving those goals, we must each have before us not only an awareness of what is wrong with American education, but also an awareness of what is very right about our current system and schools. We must have before us examples of excellence.

There are many, many Wahlerts, I am convinced, among both the public and private schools of our land. Let us seek them out and be guided by their example as we strive to perfect American education.●

#### PLIGHT OF ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, Anatoly Shcharansky is wasting away in the Soviet prison Chistopol. The latest, most distressing report of the brave dissident's condition has been relayed to the West by Anatoly's mother, Ida Milgrom. Mrs. Milgrom was able to visit her son January 5, and left that 2-hour meeting aghast at Shcharansky's failing health. As related in a New York Times article of Jan-

uary 12, she described his appearance as—

Totally unrecognizable, his cheeks were sunken, his lips were withered, his eyes were sunken and deeply ringed with black. For the entire 2 hours, I could not talk, I just looked.

Anatoly Shcharansky was sentenced in 1978 to 3 years in prison followed by 10 years in a labor camp. Precious years of this great man's life have been squandered in prison, not because he committed any crime, but because he refused to stay silent in the face of repulsive state-sponsored oppression. He has already suffered tremendously for speaking out for basic human rights and the just cause of Soviet Jewish emigration.

Anatoly Shcharansky's spirit remains alive and unbroken, but the cruel confinement is taking an increasing toll on his physical well-being. It is doubtful he can survive the harsh conditions of imprisonment any longer. The medical care afforded him has been negligible, and an ailing heart now causes him constant pain.

It is time to raise our voices in his behalf, and call once again upon the Soviet authorities to let Shcharansky go free. The Soviets risk irreversible damage to their already tarnished international image by keeping him in prison, and turning a deaf ear to the humanitarian appeals for his release. Let Shcharansky go free and be reunited with his wife Avital in Israel. If the Soviet leadership is seriously interested in improving its relations with Western nations, freeing Shcharansky would be a significant, positive step in the right direction.●

#### TRIBUTES TO BEIRUT MARINES

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1984

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while many of us have expressed sorrow and outrage at the October 23 massacre of our marines in Beirut, the village of Lyons, Ill., has gone one step further. Last December, village of Lyons President William G. Smith, in union with the American Legion Emil Scheive Post No. 699 of Lyons, sent a package of letters, newspaper clippings, and pictures to the wounded marines and the families of the deceased marines to honor the fighting men that were killed in Beirut. I understand that this may be the first of any recognition of this kind.

This is a truly touching tribute to the 230 brave men who gave their lives in defense of freedom in a war-torn land far from home. In honor of the victims of the Beirut blast, I insert in today's RECORD the articles and one of the letters sent to the surviving marines, and the victims' families:

PEACE ON EARTH—GOOD WILL TO ALL MEN  
That is the message of every Holiday Season.

We, the people of the Village of Lyons, Illinois in union with the American Legion, Emil Scheive Post 699, know the price you have paid for those words—"Peace On Earth". That sacrifice has not been forgotten.

On November 11 (Veterans' Day) The American Flag and a Marine Color Blue Ribbon were flown on all flag poles within our village and remained flying for the following week. The Marine Color Blue Ribbon has been made available, at no charge, to all our residents and the response has been tremendous. Those blue ribbons will continue to be displayed on village private homes thru the Holiday Season.

We are a village that is proud of our country, proud of our men in service and proud to show our respect for the men who have suffered and also those who have sacrificed their lives so that all men may be free.

[Excerpted from the Suburban Life Newspapers]

#### POST SAYING THANKS TO RELATIVES OF MARINES KILLED IN BEIRUT

Emil Scheive Post, American Legion, will team up with the village of Lyons to send expression of thanks to the relatives of the 230 Marines killed in a terrorist attack Oct. 23 in Lebanon.

Robert Kucera, past commander of the post, told the board Tuesday he sent a letter to President Ronald Reagan requesting the addresses of the dead soldiers, Kucera said he wrote the letter after Village President William Smith suggested a personal expression of sympathy and thanks to the relatives of the Marines would be a fitting ending to the legion's memorial to the Marines.

This week the village and residents have been flying the flag with a blue ribbon attached as a tribute to the servicemen killed when an Arab terrorist drove a truck load of explosives into Marine headquarters in Beirut. The memorial suggested by Kucera to the post following the attack, was to be for Veterans Day only. But when public interest started to peak, Kucera asked the village to continue the flag flying until Monday. Trustee Harold Novak, chairman of the Public Works Committee, gave his approval to the idea, Kucera said.

"I want to thank Trustee Novak for his assistance and Trustee (Carl) Duffek who recommended the village buy ribbons and give them to the residents."

The village has ribbons and residents may receive one at the Village Hall during its regular business hours. There is no charge for the ribbon.

Kucera said residents need not fly the flag to participate in the memorial. He said many residents have taken the ribbons and made bows out of them which they place on the front doors of their homes.

He said he hopes residents will follow that idea and keep the bows up after the observance ends.

In other action, the board named a director for the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency.

James Pilipchuck replaces Myron Keel.

#### MARINE MEMORIAL CONTINUED IN LYONS

Veterans Day may be over for the rest of the country but not in Lyons.

As a tribute to the 230 Marines who died in the terrorist bombing of their headquar-

ters in Lebanon, the village at the request of the Emil Scheive Post, American Legion, will continue to fly the flag from its light poles until Monday, according to Robert Kucera, former commander of the post.

The flags will have one addition added this Veterans Day, a ribbon the color of Marines dress blue.

That touch was added at the request of the post for Nov. 11 after Kucera suggested the idea to his fellow veterans.●

"The response has been good to the idea from the people. The more people see the ribbon, the more questions we get asking what it's all about," Kucera said.

Kucera said the post hopes the lengthened veterans observance will increase public awareness and participation in the memorial program.

Lyons residents who still wish to participate in the memorial may obtain the blue ribbon at the Village Hall. According to a spokesman for the village, a steady flow of residents came to the hall seeking the ribbon once the word spread through the town last week. More than 150 ribbons were distributed.

"Many times the first question from residents seeking ribbons was how much does it cost. The village isn't charging anything for the ribbons," the spokesman said.

The Village Board approved purchasing the ribbons at its Nov. 1 meeting.

#### ARTICLE EXPRESSED FEELINGS

(By Robert Kucera, Lyons)

Being a member and a past commander of the Emil Scheive Post, American Legion, I wish to thank The Suburban LIFE for your excellent article written by Bill Conkis in reference to our program for honoring the 230 Marines who were killed in Beirut, Lebanon.

The article has received many compliments from our membership and the citizens of Lyons.

The Suburban LIFE newspapers can be proud they have an editor such as Conkis, who has the ability to express the deep feelings of an individual in newspaper article.

#### MARINE BLUE TO FLY HIGH

(By William Conkis)

Beirut isn't exactly next door to Lyons. And the political debate about the importance of Lebanon as a key to a peaceful middle east may seem just as removed as the country to many Americans.

What does matter to the Emil Shieve Post, American Legion, Lyons, is the death of 230 marines Oct. 23 when a lone terrorist

destroyed their headquarters in Beirut by driving a truck load of explosive into it.

What matters, Robert Kucera, past commander of the post, told the Village Board Tuesday is that "something" be done to acknowledge the dedication and commitment of those dead and wounded servicemen.

"I was watching the reports of the bombing on television and suddenly I thought we need to do something as a community to honor those men. I couldn't help thinking something needed to be done," Kucera said.

With that in mind, Kucera offered a suggestion to the post membership which it quickly endorsed.

The post through Kucera asked the village to proclaim that everyone flying a flag Veterans Day, Nov. 11, and a small token of remembrance, ribbon the color of marine dress blue to the poles flying the flag.

Lyons trustees were just as quickly as the post membership to support the idea.

To encourage the ribbon flying and ensure uniformity, the board also approved purchasing ribbons and making them available at the Villa Hall for any resident wishing to participate. Ribbons are expected to arrive Tuesday morning and will be issued on a first come first serve basis.

The village will do its part by adding the ribbons to all flags to be flown from street lights on Veterans Day.●